The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

In order that these opening paragraphs may be fittingly written the editorial personality must cleave itself into its two halves.

It will be known to most of our readers that Mr. Cooke is to be nominated to the Assembly in May as the Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. The Selection Committee, charged by the General Purposes Committee with the task of nomination, had no difficulty in reaching unanimity, and their recommendation was received and sent on to the Council with the same confidence and enthusiasm. It is true that the General Purposes Committee came in for some sharp criticism both before and at the meeting of the Council. Whether it was justified it is not for me (as a member of the G.P. and Selection Committees) to say. In any event, such dissatisfaction as existed was solely with the method of procedure and not at all with the name submitted. There was no other nomination, though every opportunity was given for one to be made, and when Mr. Cooke's name was put to the vote I observed only one dissentient. If there is any safe prophecy in this uncertain world it is that, when the Council's nomination is presented to the Assembly in May, the appointment will be made with unanimity and enthusiasm. And let us hope that no misguided zealot for Congregational principles and practices will mar the occasion by raising any belated questions concerning procedure. If there are any criticisms still to be made, or if, confident of our own wisdom, we are going to presume to give guidance to our successors as to what they shall do in (we hope) the far distance, when Mr. Cooke lays down the office, let us get these matters out of the way at the Council Meeting in April. Then at the Assembly let us call Mr. Cooke, without any jarring note, to the high and responsible office for which we have chosen him. And let us do it with dignity and solemnity, and, if we may venture to say so, without too much of the happy-family-party atmosphere.

The Union must consider itself fortunate in having so good a man at its call. The office of Secretary of the Union has to some extent changed in its character during Dr. Berry's tenure of it, and it has increased vastly in importance. It requires a man with an extraordinary combination of gifts. He must be able to represent

his denomination in the highest ecclesiastical circles and in negotiations with Government departments. He must be an administrator capable of handling large-scale problems. He must be a pastor and a father to the Congregational family. He must be a prophet and a man of vision speaking often to his own people and sometimes to the world at large. But I had better not continue in this strain. Mr. Cooke is essentially a humble man, and he may be moved to hope that the Assembly will not appoint him after all! Suffice it to say that, having been closely associated with him, I believe he possesses in a high degree the combination of necessary gifts. The Union is making a wise choice.

It would, of course, be inadvisable for Mr. Cooke to continue his association with the *Quarterly* lest its comments might be supposed to be official pronouncements. The half of the editorial personality which still walks the common earth will continue to write these notes as a mere fallible mortal with no authority to speak for anybody but himself, while that half which has been translated to Olympian heights may issue his decrees with such thunders and lightnings as he pleases. L. J. T.

* * *

We cannot help being alarmed at the number of cases of breach of privilege which have recently come to light among Members of Parliament. We have no reason to think that those involved are evil or unscrupulous men whose patriotism or sense of responsibility is in question; their mistakes have been mistakes of indiscretion and they have faced up to the consequences like men. Their errors have provided opportunities for the opponents of the Government which they have not been slow to exploit, and the repercussions are likely to be serious for the administration and the Labour Party. Men without private means entering Parliamentary life, which, we understand, is so expensive that even the increased salaries are really inadequate, must be peculiarly prone to the tempting offers of journalism. The problem is not confined to Parliamentary circles alone; it is to be met in municipal affairs. The application of the party principle to civic administration means that there are many who cannot enter local politics unless they are supported by some group or other, or are given employment by some association which is prepared for them to spend much time in the affairs of the local council. The multiplication of committees makes membership of city councils almost a full-time job.

How this problem is to be solved is an important question. There are some who assert that there should be sufficient remuneration both for the Member of Parliament and the City and Urban Councillor to be completely independent, but politics is a precarious career, and a professional politician who serves with an eye to maintaining

his income would be a menace to democratic government. Some suggest a limitation of the power of the Press. The practice of employing Public Relations Officers, who give "hand-outs" to the newspapers, is on the increase. No doubt there are advantages in having such men, but, if their work were to mean a virtual muzzling of the Press, a denial of the Press-man's right to seek out information and comment upon the facts as he finds them, then freedom would suffer yet another reverse in our land.

The problem arises partly from the modern insistence of the elected representatives upon governing in detail. Rather than being content with framing the broad outlines of policy and leaving the permanent staff to carry the policy through, elected representatives tend to regard themselves as executives, and the permanent officials with all their training and qualifications are often reduced to office boys or errand boys; they may be consulted, they are not finally trusted with responsibility. Whatever final solution of the problem is offered, there can be no doubt that it will be unsatisfactory to the British people unless it safeguards the integrity of their elected representatives, for, strange as it may seem, the British people will do without brilliance in their leaders, they will tolerate a large amount of incompetence in them, but they will not endure anything which savours of a failure of integrity and trustworthiness. In this the people are right. Even in such times as these the disadvantages of unimaginative leadership or even of incompetence can be endured and, by sheer grit and determination, overcome. Stability, which matters most in a political world rendered unstable by the activities of pressure groups and the fanatical pursuit of party interests, derives only from confidence in leaders who are incorrupt and incorruptible.

* * *

The Battle of the Books (Allan Wingate, 2s. 6d.) is in the nature of a dispatch from the Front where the forces of culture are fighting for survival against what Mr. Woodrow Wyatt, M.P., has called "the barbarian attitude" of certain Government departments towards the book trade. Under the editorship of Mr. Gerard Hopkins representatives of the many branches of the trade write of their difficulties—some of them easily avoidable—and of their efforts to meet the public demand for books. How great that demand is few people realize. It is stated with authority that the demand in the bookshops is at least three times what it was in 1939, and the quota to publishers is only 70 per cent of the paper used in that year. The lending libraries tell the same story of vastly increased needs which cannot be met. In 1921 the stock of books in public libraries was 10 millions, the registered borrowers just under 2 millions and the issues 54 millions. In 1939 these figures had mounted to 32 millions,

9 millions and 247 millions. In 1947 the registered borrowers had increased to 11 millions, but many shelves are now empty because books have been used until they have fallen to pieces, and they cannot be replaced, while many recently published books cannot be obtained at all because the editions were so small. One of the most serious factors in the situation is the lack of essential school books. It was stated at a meeting of the London County Council early in the summer of 1947 that the London schools were short of a million textbooks, and the chairman of the Education Committee commented that the deficiency was more like 2 millions. There is a truly Gilbertian element in the situation when a Government raises the school age and does not see to it that books are available to make the extra year profitable. The Battle of the Books is one in which all who care about culture and the true values of life should be combatants. The little book bearing that title supplies ammunition in plenty. It is very readable, too. If it has one fault it is that there is some repetition. That is, perhaps, inevitable, but it might have been lessened if Mr. Hopkins had grasped the editorial blue pencil more firmly when he read the MSS of his very able contributors.

* * *

THE Battle of the Books goes on quietly and continuously, but it is the Battle of the Book which has lately been engaging the attention of the Press and the public—even of some sections of the Press and the public which are usually indifferent to the wordy warfare of theologians. It is at least of passing interest when the Archbishops and the Bishop of Birmingham bring heavy artillery into play with snipers busy on both sides. The Archbishop of Canterbury felt it his duty officially and publicly to condemn Dr. Barnes' book, *The Rise of Christianity*, and plainly said that, if he shared the views expressed in it, his conscience would not let him continue to hold episcopal office in the Church of England. That is not in the least likely to trouble Dr. Barnes, who is not in the habit of having regard to any man's conscience but his own. We do not know why the Archbishop felt compelled to make his pronouncement. "Ilico", writing in *The British Weekly*, suggests that Dr. Barnes' theological enemies thought that he had played into their hands and were pressing for his trial on a charge of heresy—a manœuvre which the Archbishop determined to scotch by his official condemnation of the book and his very broad hint that the Bishop ought to resign. If he has prevented a heresy hunt the Archbishop has done well, but it is not easy to see what other useful purpose his action has served. From the point of view of the furtherance of the Gospel it was a tactical blunder. The book would have been read by comparatively few people, and largely by those who would have been able to form

a more or less balanced judgment of it. It has now achieved something of the notoriety of a banned book and, unless the controversy has quite died down before another edition is available, it will be read by all sorts of people who would never have given it a thought if the Archbishop had remained silent. In Birmingham itself we have heard people say, "What's all this in the papers about the Bishop's book? I didn't know he'd written one. I must get hold of it". Dr. Barnes could have asked nothing better in the way of free publicity! Moreover, many people, who are inclined to be sceptical, are not likely to be made more sympathetic to the orthodox teaching of the Church by the Archbishop's action. They will say, "History repeats itself. This is the sort of thing that happens when an honest and truth-seeking mind dares to question the mouldering dogmas of orthodoxy".

We certainly do not agree with all that is in the Bishop's book, but we are glad we are Congregationalists! Even a Moderator might have written such a book without being told that he would resign if he had any sort of conscience! In our judgment the Bishop would not merit condemnation unless it could be proved that he was prompted to write the book by some less commendable motive than his desire to serve the cause of truth, and nobody has yet dared to question his sincerity. If he is wrong he must be answered. Those who believe he is mistaken must present the case for their own beliefs in such a way that they will have some chance of reaching readers of the Bishop's book. But the Archbishop has given him such a flying start that nobody is likely to overtake him.

Dr. C. H. Dodd has already written a devastating criticism of the book[1], and has shown its inadequacy from the standpoint of New Testament scholarship. ("This is not criticism. It is a travesty of criticism".) His pamphlet should be "required reading" for all who have read *The Rise of Christianity*. Dr. Dodd asserts that the Bishop sets out as a "Modern Christian Humanist" and then finds "critical" reasons for discarding everything which cannot be reconciled with his preconceptions. (This does not cancel out what we have said about Dr. Barnes' sincerity. Which of us does not, without intending to deceive, sometimes make facts fit theory?)

When all is said, we suspect that some of Dr. Barnes' conclusions are not so terribly shocking to many laymen, nor even to some theologians who are as far to the right as he is to the left. For example, we read in Dr. Micklem's *What is the Faith?:*

> It is small wonder, therefore, that many Christians have declared that they reject the story of the Virgin Birth with the whole cycle of Nativity narratives; and it must be frankly admitted that, apart from dogmatic considerations, the evidence

[1] *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Epworth Press, 6d.

> for the Virgin Birth is not such as we could possibly expect the scientific theologian to accept (p. 135)[2].
>
> This is a very brief summary of a most intricate and perplexing question (the evidence for the Resurrection). The right conclusion from it is that from a purely literary or historic point of approach no certain conclusion can be drawn (p. 174).

For ourselves, we wish on balance that the Bishop had not published his book. We believe there is much in it of real value, and it will prove a mental stimulus to many discerning readers. But, largely as a result of the Archbishop's action, it will be read by some who will be predisposed to accept anything which appears to "debunk" traditional beliefs on whatever grounds, who will not have the background to form a balanced judgment, and who, unfortunately, will not read Dr. Dodd as a corrective. We do not feel that the Bishop has much to offer which will help the honest seeker to find a faith or which will compel the sceptic to think again. Yet violent critics will do well to ponder the Bishop's own confession of faith contained in his Foreword:

> I personally find that the early Christian story as it can now be told explains why men, gaining understanding from prayer and sacraments, have, since the gospel was so proclaimed, worshipped Jesus the Christ as divine. I, too, so worship Him: I have been at pains that the fact should not affect my historical enquiry.

And that worship has created in the Bishop a passion for truth and social righteousness which has made him a fearless follower of his Master.

* * *

TWENTY years ago the fellow-students of Mr. Geraint Vaughan Jones clearly recognized that he was a man of outstanding intellectual power. Even in those days he had read widely and deeply beyond the dreams of most students. Since then he has continued to read (in how many languages we cannot guess!), and the product of his mature reflection is *Democracy and Civilisation* (Hutchinson, 21s.). The book was a prize-winner in Messrs. Hutchinsons' United Nations Literary Competition in the section in which Dr. W. R. Matthews and Professor J. B. S. Haldane were judges. (By the way, lest any readers should propose to invite Mr. Jones to open bazaars, we hasten to add that his prize was *not* £10,000 as was explicitly stated in some journals and in the Welsh regional programme of the B.B.C.). It is in every way a big book, and we regret that in order to reduce its bulk the publishers were compelled to use a type which will be hard on some eyes. In the first part of

[2] *Cf.* Garvie, *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*, p. 43: "The virgin-birth, disputed as the fact is, cannot be relied on in any convincing argument for the divinity of Jesus, and is indeed irrelevant . . ."

the book Mr. Jones discusses the nature of history and civilization and the relation between politics and ethics. In the last part he deals with the Christian understanding of history. He sets forth the New Testament interpretation and then summarizes the views of five contemporary thinkers—Brunner, Tillich, Berdyaev, Niebuhr and Toynbee. Mr. Jones points out that one thing is common to all these interpreters—

> the conviction that history is not meaningless, that human decisions are the stuff of which it is made, and that the strivings of individuals and of communities are given significance through reference to something which is not part of history but "beyond it". The purpose of history is the development of individuals into free beings who can be called the children of God, and this purpose may be fulfilled by those whose possession of this freedom may turn them into God's children or into rebels against him (p. 276).

Mr. Jones believes that liberal democracy alone can give us that "open society" in which man can live his true life.

The author says that his book is intended not for the philosopher and theologian, but for the "intelligent reader". Some, who can stake a fair claim to be so called, will probably find the book hard-going now and again, but the discipline will be worth while. Ministers, in particular, ought to read it. In these hard times a guinea may take a bit of finding, but those who buy the book and study it will feel that they have more for their money than they would get in much more than a guinea's worth of small, ephemeral books.

* * *

We recently received a little book which has been published privately, entitled *The Free Church Diocese of Guildford,* by an "Old Local Preacher". Copies (price 1s. 6d.) are obtainable from the Rev. Alfred Kaye, minister of the Guildford Congregational Church.

The book is the work of the late William Bateman, a Guildford business man, a pillar of the Guildford Church and for fifty years a lay preacher, and it tells quite simply of the founding and maintenance of the village causes which he served.

Although the story is predominantly of local interest, it has a wider significance not only in drawing attention to the fine service which hundreds like Mr. Bateman have given to our Churches but in raising the question of the future development of this kind of ministry. Some time ago we commented in these pages on a report issued by the British Council of Churches entitled *The Land, The People, and the Churches,* and indicated the conditions in the countryside which this enquiry revealed, especially in the effects of the migration to the towns, the corrosion of secularism in village culture particularly in those hamlets adjacent to great cities, and the general decline

of Parish Churches and Village Chapels. A speaker in the B.B.C. programme "Country Magazine" recently declared that the city dwellers have been made aware of the importance of the countryman but the countryman is wondering whether, when the need is past and the British markets are full of cheaper foreign food again, the townsman will forget and lapse into indifference once more. No one can give a final assurance to the countryman about this, but it is clear that such a possibility is a very long way off, even if it ever occurs again. Government policy is now directed towards the turning back of the stream of migration, and there is no doubt that in the coming years many townsmen will be moving to the country to work, and in the countryside of Britain there will be great settlements of volunteer labour from abroad. Incidentally this has always been a plank in the Socialist platform. The *Communist Manifesto* (which in so many of its proposals now appears a very mild and moderate document) outlined a policy for agriculture as involving "The redistribution and amelioration of agricultural land, the creation of labour armies especially for agriculture, and the unification of agricultural with industrial labour and the gradual abolition of the difference between town and country". It is doubtful whether any party which comes to power will be able to afford a failure to implement such a policy. We can certainly look forward to a long period when the industry of agriculture will be assuming increasing importance.

When we regard the work of the Churches in the light of this possibility, it is apparent that we are not equipped to meet it. Ministers and members of our village Churches will not misread in our comment any reproach or reflection upon their devoted work. Many country chapels are unattractive in form and furnishing, and are not likely to appeal to the countrymen of the future with their background of city life and the modern amenities which they will demand, and doubtless get, in the countryside. This matter demands informed and concentrated attention.

In some counties a start has been made in rural evangelism, in the interest of which teams of ministers from the towns go to the villages. These campaigns have great merit in themselves and are an encouragement to the village Churches, but they only serve to emphasize the need for increased lay service and for ministers who will prepare themselves to accept country pastorates in the full awareness that such a ministry demands at least as much specialization as a ministry in the city or the suburb.

If we are to meet this need we shall require recruits for the ranks of our lay preachers, resources for the equipment and modernizing of our village Churches, and ministers who are ready to serve in the country superintending groups of Churches.

We may yet discover that the first step in winning the heart of Britain for Christ means winning the villages for Him.

* * *

THE Independent Press is to be congratulated on the reprinting of another of Dr. P. T. Forsyth's books, *The Work of Christ* (10s. 6d.). The book was originally given as lectures at Dr. Campbell Morgan's annual conference at Mundesley in Norfolk. In a valuable little memoir printed at the beginning his daughter, Mrs. Jessie Forsyth Andrews, remarks that some find Forsyth's style "difficult, irritating, barbarous, affected and regard it as the cause of his inability to reach his generation". Whatever may be true of his work in general—and on that opinions will always differ—this book is straightforward and direct enough to satisfy any reasonable reader. The lectures were delivered extempore, and the careful revision to which Forsyth refers in his preface has not been allowed to destroy their spoken character. There could hardly be a better introduction to Forsyth, especially for those who have been scared by his "obscurity".

The centenary of Dr. Forsyth's birth will fall on 12th May of this year. We hope to mark the occasion by publishing two articles by distinguished theologians who were students at Hackney College under him. Dr. Sydney Cave will write on Forsyth as a man and a theologian, and Dr. H. F. Lovell Cocks will show in non-technical language the relevance of his thinking to present issues.

* * *

WE include in this issue the first of two articles by Dr. H. F. Lovell Cocks on "The Church in the Atomic Age", and our readers may be interested to know how they came to be written. The British Council of Churches appointed a Commission to study questions relating to atomic power. The Commission began its meetings in January 1946 and issued its report under the title *The Era of Atomic Power*. The Council invited our Union to send in its comments and criticisms, and the General Purposes Committee appointed a group consisting of K. L. Parry, S. M. Watts, W. A. Whitehouse and Dr. Will Moore to draft a reply. This group produced an interim statement. Dr. Cocks was then added and the group met on 2nd June—Mr. Watts being absent. They agreed that, in addition to any final statement that Congregationalists might make to the British Council of Churches, there should be something written specifically for Congregational Church Meetings and groups who might be studying *The Era of Atomic Power*. This latter document, they thought, should do three things:

(1) It should supplement the *Era of Atomic Power* in giving a more realistic treatment of the political issues involved.

(2) It should help our people to relate their faith in God as sovereign Lord of the world to the situation in which they find themselves, and

(3) it should call attention to the significance of Congregationalism as the well-nigh inevitable form the Church takes when she is under persecution by a totalitarian state.

Dr. Cocks' articles aim at being of use to those who are studying *The Era of Atomic Power*. They are *not* a draft of the final statement which will have to go to the British Council of Churches. They attempt to deal with the issues covered in the discussions of the group to which Dr. Cocks belongs, but the other members of the group have not seen the articles and are, therefore, in no way responsible for anything they contain.

* * *

We commend to our readers *The Answer is there,* the popular report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1947. Since 1932 the Report has been written by the Rev. John A. Patten, but this is the last which will come from his pen. He is resigning from his post as Editorial Secretary, but he will continue to serve the Society as its historian. He is at present engaged in writing the history of the Society from 1904 onwards. The first volume, covering the years 1904-29, is already on the way. In the second volume Mr. Patten hopes to carry the history forward to 1954, in which year the Society will celebrate its 150th birthday.

* * *

The International Missionary Council announces that Dr. John A. Mackay, President of Princeton (Presbyterian) Theological College, New Jersey, will succeed Bishop James Chamberlain Baker as Chairman of the Council on 1st January. Although most of his work has been done in America, Dr. Mackay is a Scot born in Inverness in 1889. After graduating at Aberdeen he studied at the University of Madrid in preparation for work as an educational missionary in Latin America in the service of the Free Church of Scotland. He has a vast knowledge of missionary affairs. In 1932 he was appointed Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, U.S.A., and since 1945 has been its President. He is the author of a number of books in Spanish and English and is the Editor of *Theology Today*.

* * *

The Index for 1947 (Vol. XXV) will be ready shortly. It can be obtained (price 6d.) from the Manager of The Independent Press, Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

THE VESTURE OF THE ETERNAL[1]

By F. E. England, Ph.D., M.A., B.D.

In the first chapter of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* there is a stately passage which not only serves as an admirable introduction to my theme but provides it also with a title.

> Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

Into this scene of transiency set over against eternal changelessness, the writer proceeds to introduce man.

> Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands. . . . Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. . . . But now we see not yet all things put under him; but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour. . . . For it became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through the things he endured (παθημάτων).

These two passages finely express the Christian philosophy of nature and history. They combine the Greek view that the temporal process is always "becoming" or in the making, with the Hebrew view that history is the vehicle of divine purpose. They make two assertions of cardinal importance. The first is that our transient world is but the vesture of the eternal, continuously ageing, wearing out, being changed and put away. Its events are an orderly but evanescent cascade, every item falling at the moment of birth into nothingness. The second is the striking assertion that man's real glory lies not in his supremacy over all other things but in his capacity to achieve perfection, as Jesus did, through what he endures. This second assertion is the answer to the pessimism raised by the first. Man rises above the tyranny of change and decay and gains his victory over the world by relinquishing his desire for possession or for security in the changing things of the finite world and by enlarging and refining his spiritual capacities in and through his handling of the things that perish. The Christian assurance is that in all the fleeting experiences and the endless transformation

[1] *The Drew Lecture,* delivered at Livingstone Hall, London, and printed by permission of the Trustees.

of scenes something of eternal value is being wrought. Recent developments in physical theory have given a new appropriateness to the figure of changing vesture. Formerly the physical universe was regarded as an enormous elastic solid with three dimensions; forward and backward, up and down, and across—a kind of box with its sides, top and bottom pressed outwards to infinity—a container in which all physical events took place and all objects had their station. Under the pressure of empirically ascertained fact, this simple view, together with the notion of an absolute uniform space has had to be abandoned. Things and events are now considered to derive their reality only from their relations one to another.

An important consequence for the lay mind is that the old familiar mental picture of physical reality is no longer trustworthy. As Sir James Jeans puts it:

> The clearest way to represent to ourselves the events of the material world is to think of them as we should of the markings on a temperature chart. The vertical lines would show the degrees (or space qualities) and the horizontal the time qualities.

In the place of the colossal box with its definite parts and positions we have a continuum of point-instants in which every point has its date. To express it otherwise, in the place of the old ether of space we have an ether of spatio-temporal events. We no longer think of things as occupying space nor of events as taking place in time. Time and space are not independent realities prior to events and things; they are abstractions from the fundamental space-time continuum with its endless mutability. The "stuff" of nature consists not of static things but of events, one event growing into another as it passes. What appear to us to be enduring things are recurrent qualities of passing events. The qualities are, as Whitehead says, ingressive in the events. A table is a more or less permanent association of sense-qualities in a series of events which, connected together by mutual overlapping, are synthesized as one prolonged event. The "enduring object" is such because of the reiteration of its qualities. A new object is created when some new quality becomes ingressive in the passing events. In the whole series of events there is nothing that abides; there is only a continuous series of changes. As a vesture the face of the earth is changed.

This way of conceiving our phenomenal world puts the problem of the relation of the temporal to the eternal in new form. Consider, first, the nature of time. I imagine most of us find it difficult to think of time otherwise than as a continuous medium in which events take place, just as we think of space as a static medium in which things find place. All that is simultaneously visible at any one moment is said to be contemporaneous, and as time passes by it provides the apparently stationary with a history, and the changeful

with successiveness. The Eddystone lighthouse appears to stand firm through a given "stretch of time", while the flashes of its lamp, though occurring at one and the same spatial locality, are separated by intervals of time. In the case of both the continuous and the periodic, we have a series of events (for the lighthouse is no less a series of events than are its flashes of light) marked by different dates.

It is well-nigh inevitable that, by so thinking of time, we should assume that four successive events, A. B. C. D., are in a relation of juxtaposition so far as time is concerned. This further involves that the present moment of time is but a fragment of a continuously moving time-process. It is assumed that from the point of view of the immediate present, two long arms of time stretch endlessly out, the one into the past, the other into the future. As Lotze puts it:

> These two abysses of obscurity, however empty and formless, are yet supposed to exist, and to constitute an environment of which the unknown interior offers a dwelling-place for the non-existent—a place into which it has disappeared, or whence it comes.

The most obvious feature of this conception of time is its tacit dependence upon spatial imagery, and it is the spatial imagery that surrounds our problem with confusion.

Let us turn, for a moment, to that figure by which the religious mind represents to itself the nature of time.

> Time like an ever rolling stream
> Bears all its sons away.

Actually that figure remains effective only so long as we imagine ourselves to be gazing at only one very small portion of the river. Stand with me on the little highland bridge at the Linn o' Dee above Braemar. Lean over the parapet looking upstream. Your eye picks out a twig floating on the surface some fifty feet away. Having travelled many miles with the stream, it lingers for a moment in the swirling waters above the fall and is then swept underneath the bridge and lost to view. So time "bears all its sons away". Come now to the other parapet and see the fateful plunge which sends the unresisting twig upon its new adventure. Long after your vision is able to follow it you continue to think of it as being borne along to the eternal sea.

Now, let me ask, what in this process corresponds to time? The obvious answer is that it is not the river as a whole, but the flow, and the flow is being conceived from your static point of view on the bridge. You are thinking of time as something that moves or flows along a line, and I am going to suggest that to think of time as something that moves along a fixed line involves absurdity. Think of a fixed line X.Y. Let time be the moving flow A.B. Then you have

the absurd situation that while X. and Y. are contemporaneous, A. and B., which are respectively at the same positions as X. and Y., are separated from each other by a stretch of time.

I am aware of Mr. J. W. Dunne's intriguing resort to an endless regress to account for what from one point of view is successive and from another co-existent. But I do not feel called upon to discuss his view here.

In short, then, to think of time as an ever rolling stream is tacitly to presuppose another time (the time of the river bed) as a kind of background in which the stream is regarded as flowing. If we relinquish the idea of a river bed or static background for the flow and think of time as the flow or passage of a dynamic reality from one phase to another, we must abandon the notion that the events A. B. C. D. are in any sense contiguous; that is, we must cease to apply spatial imagery to the concept of time.

Are we to conclude, then, that reality is nothing more than that which appears in this fleeting instant called "now"? Mr. Dunne and Mr. Priestley are not alone in refusing to accept so startling a view. From Plato's day to ours it has been widely held that the reality which reveals itself to mortals slowly and progressively is in itself timelessly existent; that time is the moving image of eternity, and that the moving finger which, "having writ, moves on", is merely the human consciousness passing over a timeless field. Man's awareness of his own experience and of the world outside him is his temporal and progressive apprehension of what, for an infinite mind, would be *tota simul*. God, so it is contended, knows at once and altogether the events that occur successively in our finite universe. He knows events which for us are not yet, and He knows them not as about to be but as existing in one eternal now. To the finite consciousness, past and future events are not now actual. This means that they are not contemporaneous with our present act of awareness. But, it is argued, they are actual to the infinite mind whose awareness, instead of moving across the field of reality, comprehends it in one omniscient cognition.

From this it would seem to follow that time is subjective in character; that in short it is a form of our perception and not a feature of the real world. There appear to me, however, to be several objections to the subjective view of time.

First, and very briefly, I see no good reason for supposing that to the mind of God past, present and future co-exist in one eternal now. The ancient argument is that such omniscience inevitably follows from divine perfection. But it is at least arguable that perfect knowledge is knowledge of things as they are, and if one of the qualities of things (for example, my own power of choice) is their indeterminateness, perfect knowledge would cognize them as

indeterminate. Moreover, to conceive God as timeless is to remove Him from any real relationship with the temporal life of humanity and destroy the very possibility of His hearing and answering the cry of human need.

Secondly, there is this serious obstacle to our accepting the view that time is a subjective form of perception: our acts of apprehending, as indeed all our mental processes, are temporal, and as such they presuppose the reality of time, for time is necessary to their very existence. If then time is the pre-condition of there being any mental activity whatsoever, it would seem impossible to attribute to the finite mind the power to invest the contents of its experience with the form of time. Temporality is given in and with every experience; it is a condition of the exercise of mental activity and not its product.

Further, so far from the mind endowing the contents of its experience with temporality, it is a characteristic of our cognition that it imposes fixity upon its contents. Every act of cognizing is a judgment implicitly expressed in the form, "This is". The terms of that judgment are static. The subject consists of a portion of reality selected from the total field and considered by itself as it is, or was, at a particular moment. And whatever changes may occur, it remains eternally true (if the proposition be true) that such a thing *was* at that particular moment. The process of knowing is a process of discriminating certain features of an ever-changing reality, and as such it is a process of translating transient realities in terms of eternal truths. That is not to say that we cognize things as eternal; what is true is that our judgments are concerned with static views of reality somewhat as photographs are static representations of what is actually in continuous process of change.

How then do we ever become aware of succession? If each and every act of knowing takes, so to speak, a snapshot of reality, it might appear that the process of knowing resembled the adding of fresh pages of snapshots to a huge album, the superseded pages representing the data of remembrance. Would there then be any ground for attributing actual continuity to reality? Might not temporality after all be a mere inference from our own undoubted consciousness of identity amid change?

For the solution of these problems it is necessary to bear in mind two important considerations. First, it must not be supposed that because our apprehended contents are static we thereby confer the form of changelessness upon the field of reality. In an act of perception, our awareness is directed not upon any mental content (as Locke, Berkeley and Hume gratuitously assumed) but upon a portion of the real world. We immediately discriminate certain features of that world, and in so doing we effect no change in those

features. We name them or pass a judgment upon them, but we do not bring into being another existent world which more or less imperfectly mirrors the external world. Our snapshots have no real existence; they are merely ways in which we apprehend reality. They cannot be pasted in a book side by side or one after another. It is only when we view them in abstraction from the total cognitive situation that we are able in any way to regard them as having permanence. In brief they are not snapshots but disappearing views.

Secondly, no single act of being aware of reality stands by itself, alone and separate. The acts of awareness together form a continuous process of being aware, and their character of continuity is made possible by the mind's inherent power of retentiveness. The perceiving of a table is not a momentary event without duration, but an event which can be analysed into earlier and later phases. It is this "specious present", as it has been called, that makes a judgment of successiveness possible. In William James's vivid language:

> The unit of composition of our perception of time is a duration, with a bow and stern as it were—a rearward and a forward-looking end. . . . The content of the duration thus steadily perceived is in a constant flux, events dawning into its forward end as fast as they fade out of its rearward end, and each of them changing its time co-efficient from "not-yet" or "not-quite-yet" to "just-gone" or "gone" as it passes by. Meanwhile the specious present, the intuited duration, stands permanent, like the rainbow on the waterfall, with its own quality unchanged by the events that stream through it.

Taking our stand, now, upon our own specious present, let us try to construct our philosophy of time and eternity from what is involved therein. In so doing, we are but following Kant's lead in analysing the implications of our awareness of change. We find that experience presents us with no mere successiveness but with sequence and continuity. There is no clear-cut ceasing to be of the old and coming to be of the new, nor is there any co-existence of events with different dates. Every event merges into the next, A. into B., B. into C., C. into D. The one dies that the other may live; but the death of the one is the birth of the other. There is no break of continuity. If A. B. C. and D. take place in extremely rapid succession, they appear in our "specious present" to constitute one single event as, for example, the luminous line described by a falling star. The whole series occurs within the "moment" of experience. Where the succession is less rapid it is comparatively easy to discern the co-operation of memory in the work of linking the "just-gone" with the "now". Nature presents us with a continuous sequence of events no one of which abides. Our memory, as Bergson says,

solidifies into sensible qualities the continuous flow of events. In reality there is never more than one single position of the falling star, for nothing is left of its past positions. In the oscillations of the pendulum it is either on the right or on the left or in some intermediate position, or rather the event which we interpret as the present position of the pendulum is a passing event dying while it lives, already giving itself to the next. The continuity of nature is, as Whitehead says, made possible by the overlapping of events. Nature is essentially a process, a γιγνόμενον, a becoming, and the elements of becomingness are events which are in a non-temporal relation of "extending-over". Reality is duration in passage; continuousness in sequence; identity in difference. πάντα ῥεῖ, all things flow; but instead of a river of time we have an everchanging reality.

It is unfortunate that we are in the habit of applying the term "time" to two different things: (*a*) to the passingness of events (as when we loosely speak of the passage of time or the flight of time), and (*b*) to our conceptual measurements of that passingness. Our conceptual measurements are based upon certain rhythmic features in the passage or sequence. First there is the rhythm of day and night, itself due to the revolutions of the earth on its axis. So we get a one-day rule which we subdivide into twenty-four hours, and these into minutes and seconds. Beyond this is the wider rhythm of the periodic movements of the earth in its orbit round the sun.

But more fundamental than these measurements is that continuousness in sequence which is what we actually experience. Strictly it is not time that passes; it is the fashion of this world that is in continuous passage. Time has no separate existence but derives its reality from the prior fact of change. If there were no change there would be nothing successive to measure.

Can we now penetrate the phenomena of continuous change and discover the eternal? It would be vain to look for it in the changes themselves, since all that we ever perceive is in the process of passing. Yet we should never be aware of change were it not for something in ourselves that transcends change.

May I remind you that the spiritual conception of immortality came not from superstition with its elaborate mechanism of mitigation; it came when the Owl of Minerva took its flight. It came from reflection upon the dignity of human nature and the implications of self-hood.

Already we have found, in the specious present, some firm ground for our feet. My acts of awareness succeed one another, but the focus of my awareness remains in one eternal *now*, even though its object be an ancient event or one of those future happenings alleged to be apprehended by the clairvoyant mind. This permanent *now-ness* itself presupposes self-identity. My empirical acts of awareness

succeed one another, and my self may be enriched or otherwise modified by my successive experiences; but the thing that remains is my identity. In Kahlil Gibran's language, "the timeless in you knows that yesterday is but today's memory and tomorrow is today's dream".

It is true that I can measure the duration of my self-consciousness in years, but that is simply because of the changes in what I apprehend. I am not really measuring my identity, for my identity is not spread across the years. I am an enduring *now*. I remember the past; I anticipate the future but I exist only and always *now*. My own mental states share in the general passingness, but if my mind were identical with its temporal and fleeting experiences I should not be aware of those experiences. But because I can take my stand upon the enduring *now*, I am both aware of passage and sequence, and can hold my successive experiences in a unity of awareness. I am not submerged in the transient, for I am already a citizen of an abiding city. All the things I experience, save one, are objects of knowledge; I experience myself not as an object of knowledge but as subjective enjoyment. My *Erlebnis*, my possession and enjoyment of myself, is my abiding reality standing outside all empirical changes,

> . . . a mark of everlasting light
> Above the howling senses' ebb and flow.

They shall perish, but self-consciousness remains; they all shall wax old as doth a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be changed; but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail.

Following the clue thus suggested I would remind you that there are certain modes of our present experience in which the feature of passingness is reduced to a minimum and the character of abidingness is correspondingly enhanced. There are phases of experience in which we are so acutely aware of time that the process of passingness seems to be retarded. When on the other hand we are absorbed in deep enjoyment, we become blissfully unaware of time, and it is to be observed that only afterwards, when in calm reflection we look back upon the experience do we say: How time flies! While we are absorbed in enjoyment we are, like Faust and Helena, relatively unaware of passage.

> . . . Nor past nor future shades an hour like this;
> But wholly in the present is our bliss.

If further we ask ourselves what kind of experiences they are in which the feature of temporal passage is eclipsed, we find that they have to do either with the cessation of full consciousness, as in coma, sleep, hypnosis or deep reverie on the one hand, and on the other

with experiences of value, *i.e.* experiences which are accompanied by deep satisfaction—physical, mental or spiritual. Physical delights may render us insensible of time; so may intellectual and spiritual enjoyments.

> . . . Sensation, soul and form
> All melted into him; they swallowed up
> His animal being; in them did he live,
> And by them did he live; they were his life.
> In such access of mind, in such high hour
> Of visitation from the living God
> Thought was not; in enjoyment it expired.

For our present purpose we may disregard all except mental and spiritual delights. Among these we have the fascination of the novel and strange, provided it is also interesting. The element of interest is of greater importance than that of novelty, for the novel will fail to engross unless it be also interesting. But to be interesting is to answer to some deep need in our own nature. Hence that which obliterates time is that which ministers to some need, *i.e.* it is an intellectual or spiritual value.

If, then, we make abstraction from all bodily interests and concentrate upon those realities which are unaffected by passage, we get some sort of clue to eternity. Our mental interest no longer being directed upon the evanescent but upon timeless realities, there would still be a consciousness of pursuit and of passage from one stage of understanding to a fuller stage; but the consciousness of measured sequence would be reduced to a minimum by the thrilling enjoyment of the contemplation. Carry the same process on to a stage at which the mental activity no longer moves from fragment to fragment of the realm of timeless realities, no longer knows in part but sees face to face, and we have the specious present widened to infinity. The pursuit of an end would give place to the enjoyment of a timeless whole in which means and end are reciprocal within the perfect and eternal unity. No longer would there be progress toward knowledge, but there would be enjoyment of knowing. Adapting Boethius's famous definition (*interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio*) we might describe eternity as the enjoyment of life without beginning or end in its fulness and all together. Time would not be destroyed, but since it would be merely the conceptual measurement of continuous enjoyment, it would be reduced to insignificance, for perfect enjoyment is oblivious of time or any other form of measurement.

Let me add that there is no reason to imagine that what is permanently enjoyed is a system of timeless truths. Truth is always truth about reality, and it is the enjoyment of reality that carries with it eternal bliss. But reality, so far as we know it, is characterized by

passingness; and so long as there is passingness there is the possibility of awareness of the new. It would seem, therefore, that the "enjoyment of life" without beginning or end in its fulness and all together must wait upon the cessation of creativeness and novelty in the real world.

Supposing the moment arrived when no fresh features were any longer ingressive in passing events; supposing temporal passage had at last exhausted the realm of realizable values; supposing the Kingdom of Heaven, God's purpose in creation, were at last achieved; then reality would cease to present features of change, and time would have nothing to measure save the perfect enjoyment which is eternal bliss.

I have left little time for the further question as to whether we have good reason to believe that what has been described as the permanent "now" is not only permanent so long as this mortal life lasts, but is destined to persist eternally.

Of the manifold experiences of human life, we may say with certainty that many are destined to disappear for ever when man's body no longer serves as the instrument of his perception, emotion and action. May we not with equal assurance maintain that the passingness of all things leaves no empty void but is man's occasion and opportunity for the development of his potential spiritual capacities? Scientific men appear to be unanimous that the physical universe will one day strangle with cold fingers the last of its human offspring and go on its way to inevitable dissolution into the primitive fire-mist. There is no eternity in the earth or the heavenly bodies. They shall perish. Nor is eternity to be found in human history, for the procession of civilizations must vanish into thin air. But what of the soul of man? Is human existence a plaything in the hands of God, like a coloured toy-balloon which reflects more of the light of the sun as it becomes more distended, and finally bursts into nothingness?

There is no scientific or philosophical reason for arguing from the cessation of physical activities to the destruction of the human spirit. Such inference could be justified only if mind were a mere function of brain. But that is not true, for there is no warrant for attributing to the brain anything other than physiological function, and notwithstanding the Behaviourists, no physiologist would include mind among those functions. Even John Stuart Mill wrote (in his *Essay on Immortality*):

> There are thinkers who, because the phenomena of life and consciousness are dissociated in their minds, by undeviating experience, with the action of material organs, think it an absurdity *per se* to imagine it possible that those phenomena can exist under other conditions. But they should remember that

the uniform co-existence of one fact with another does not make the one fact a part of the other, or the same with it. The relation of thought to a material brain is no metaphysical necessity, but simply a constant co-existence within the limits of observation.

To speak more affirmatively, there is one consideration which weighs heavily against the extinction of man's spirit. It is that his mortal existence is never environed solely by physical things. Doubtless his body serves as the medium of his intercourse with all objects whatsoever, but in his most deeply personal relationships the body plays a lowly part. My enjoyment of the mind of Plato (in so far as I can enjoy another's mind) makes few demands upon the passing things of earth; and my love for someone no longer in the flesh comes very near Professor Hallett's description of "the self possessing itself in its other, possessing the other not as other but as self".

Most of all, man's intercourse with God and all his passionate striving to realize the eternal values of the Kingdom of God, although it takes its rise in the fleeting experiences of a mortal mind, soars away above the perishable things of earth and makes him a partaker of something that cannot die. To enjoy such fellowship is, as St. John declares, to have passed already from death to life.

So as we reflect upon the changeful dying world in which the human drama is set, let us not "stretch lame hands of faith and grope". Let us rather take our stand upon the conviction that since, as Plato said, man is not an earthly but a heavenly plant (*φυτὸν οὐκ ἔνγειον ἀλλ' οὐράνιον*), He for Whom and by Whom are all things will bring many sons to glory in the company of the Captain of their salvation who himself was perfected through the things he endured.

The Rev. E. C. E. Bourne's *The Anglicanism of William Laud* (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.) succeeds in disinterring a figure to respect, but not to admire. Laud, although heavily whitewashed, emerges as a conscientious, able and devout ecclesiastical statesman. He was (*pace* Mr. Bourne) neither a saint, nor even a systematic theologian. The author's painstaking researches might have been used to better advantage on Laud's contemporary, Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, whose *Preces Private* were the product of a saint.

The Headmaster of Sherborne School (Mr. A. R. Wallace) writes a useful and diverting handbook of apologetics in *A Conversation about Christianity* (Gifford, 5s.), in which a padre counters a materialist businessman, a superstitious Indian Army officer, and an agnostic doctor. The characterization and conversation are lifelike and the arguments for and against the Christian faith are well developed.

HORTON DAVIES.

THE CHURCH IN THE ATOMIC AGE—I

By H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D.

The purpose of these two articles[1] is not to do all over again what has been done so admirably in the Report prepared by a Commission of the British Council of Christian Churches and published by the S.C.M. Press under the title *The Era of Atomic Power*[2]. In its marshalling of the relevant facts, its diagnosis of the situation, and its presentation of the issues with which the advent of atomic power is confronting us, this document takes its place as the indispensable basis of our Christian thinking on the subject. Church meetings and study groups seeking guidance in their discussions on the Report could not do better than use the *Study Outline on the Era of Atomic Power*, compiled by the Secretary of the Commission, the Rev. J. Davis McCaughey[3]. What we are trying to do in these articles is to carry a little further than the Report carries it the consideration of the Church's duty in the present situation, and to do this with special reference to our own Congregational churches.

I

The report published by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, *Atomic Warfare and the Christian Faith*, goes the length of condemning as morally indefensible the use of atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Some members of the British Commission would have liked the Commission to associate itself with this condemnation, but others demurred, on the ground "that they were not yet sufficiently in possession of all the facts that had to be weighed by those in whose hands the decision rested". This reservation of judgment seems to rest on the assumption that our use of the atomic bomb will be justified if it turns out that more human lives were saved by the shortening of the war in the Far East than were lost by the means taken to shorten it. Now the Report reminds us that this was the plea with which the Italians justified their use of poison gas in Abyssinia and the Nazis their bombing of Rotterdam. Does it mean that we are justified in using any weapon, however frightful and indiscriminate may be the devastation it causes, if by using it we can knock our opponent out and win the

1 The second article will appear in our April issue.
2 S.C.M. Press, 2s.
3 Obtainable from the S.C.M. Headquarters, Annandale, North End Road, N.W.11.

war? If it does, then can we claim for the Allies a moral justification that is not also open to Hitler? Only if we look beyond the military victory to the ultimate end it serves. We may say that while Germany and Japan would have used their victory to enslave the nations, we used ours to set them free and to save democracy from destruction, and that *a war fought in defence of democracy is a just war*. Let us look at this.

According to Christian tradition, which in its main stream has never been pacifist, a *just war* is one waged by the State in defence of its territory, nationals and legitimate interests—or those of its allies—when these are attacked by an aggressor. Further, it is one waged with due regard for international agreements and conventions touching the declaration and conduct of hostilities, the rights of neutrals and non-combatants, and the humane treatment of prisoners of war. Finally, it is one in which damage is not inflicted on the enemy beyond the measure dictated by military necessity. How far does a war fought today comply with these conditions?

The atomic bombs in the Far East and the raids on the industrial Rhineland violated the rights of non-combatants. It may be argued that men and women making munitions are virtually combatants, though this plea will not cover the children killed in the raids. We shall have to admit that in modern warfare there are no non-combatants, and that the old condition has become inoperative and unreal. Every war is now "total" war, and military necessity dictates that you shall knock out your opponent as completely as possible and as swiftly as you can. What remains of the traditional conception of a just war? The object for which it is fought and its nature as a war of defence. Democracy is undoubtedly a legitimate national interest, but what are we to say about *defensive* war? Has that term any clear meaning today?

In a remarkable broadcast address, Mr. R. K. C. Ensor drew attention to the practical obliteration of the distinction between defence and aggression. In the conditions of modern warfare, he said, a successful defence against possible aggression depends upon being prepared at the moment when war breaks out. If you prepare too soon, your weapons will be obsolete—so rapid is scientific development in this field. If you begin preparing too late, you will be overwhelmed before you have mobilized your war potential. You must therefore be able to forecast almost to the hour the outbreak of hostilities, and the only way in which you can be sure of doing this is to choose the time and start the war yourself. Thus aggression is the only defence that is likely to succeed. We are reminded of Hitler's plea, many times repeated, that his invasions of Poland, Norway, and the Low Countries were purely defensive measures, designed to forestall the Allies.

On this showing, the old Christian argument for war, that built on the distinction between defence and agression, falls to the ground. Shall we therefore adapt our reasoning to the facts, and say that for the defence of democracy we have the right to use atomic bombs and whatever new weapons may be invented, in order to forestall a would-be aggressor and knock him out before he has the chance to attack us? If we take this line, we must consider a possibility not mentioned in the British Report—that even before the war breaks out we may have killed democracy by the very preparations we have been making to preserve it.

Democracy is not only a philosophy of life, but a way of holding it and putting it into practice. The really significant difference between totalitarianism and democracy is between the methods on which they rely in maintaining their ascendancy. The Nazi doctrines were imposed by force, whether as naked physical coercion or as a more subtle psychological "conditioning" and indoctrination. In a truly democratic society, force would always be subordinated to the main end of democracy, which is the development of responsible citizenship in the individual through the quickening of his *conscience*. The battle for the freedom of the religious conscience has been the greatest single factor in the development of our democratic way of life. But if democracy is to survive the Atomic Age, a new battle must be fought—a battle for the freedom and integrity of the scientific conscience. If we are left much longer in our present suspense, and preparations for war go on unchecked by any effective international ban on atomic weapons or control of their production, it is hard to see how any department of scientific research can escape State dictation and surveillance. For who knows what chance discovery may not open the way towards the invention of a new weapon? In the long run, this means the death of science. In the short run, it spells the end of democracy; for a dictatorship that can bring its scientists to heel will have little difficulty in regimenting the rest of us.

When people say that atomic warfare will be "the end of civilization", what do they mean? The Report is not as clear as it might be in the use of this phrase. By "the end of civilization" we might mean the destruction of the material basis upon which our physical existence rests. Radioactive particles released by the discharge of atomic energy can make the soil barren, contaminate drinking water, and poison food stocks. Such effects, added to the destruction of public services and communications over wide areas, could soon reduce modern cities to famine conditions. The chaos on the Rhine after the concentrated R.A.F. and American bombing is a devastation quite insignificant compared with what could be brought about in an industrial area by a few atomic bombs.

But more serious than the material destruction and even the loss of life would be the deterioration of human character. The disintegration of the social structure would reduce human society to a mass of units engaged in a desperate struggle for bare survival. We have seen the beginnings of such deterioration in our own time. What it might mean on the scale of atomic international warfare we can hardly guess, though J. J. Connington's *Nordenholt's Million*[4] may help our imagination here. And although this social chaos might not be universal, it would be mastered and replaced only by some totalitarian régime which would spell for us the end of civilization in yet another sense, *viz.* the extinction of freedom and of the democratic way of life. It is pictures of this sort that we have in our minds when we think of the end of civilization. But all of them are pictures of what happens to the people on whom the bombs fall. Meanwhile, we may ask whether civilization fares any better among the people who make the bombs and use them with such a well-timed stroke that they themselves suffer none of these things. After all, civilization is neither the material conditions upon which it rests, nor even the institutions and social customs in which it is expressed. It is fundamentally a state of mind and an attitude of will. It is the state of being civilized. Ideally, it means being characteristically and completely human, it means being charitable and compassionate, and sensitive to the wrongs and sufferings of one's fellows; for to be human means to be humane. We are forced, therefore, to ask how it fared with the Christian civilization of the Allies when young American airmen dropped bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki as part of the day's work. We can come nearer home and ask how it fared with Christian civilization when our own young airmen strafed the crowded cities of the Rhineland, and when we here in Britain read of their exploits.

At first we were all shocked, but did we not soon recover ourselves? Did we not tell ourselves that we were justified in taking reprisals for the bombing of Coventry and London? Then, that we were justified in using our manifest superiority in the air to shorten the war? And, finally, that Hitler would have done as much and more had he had the chance? We got used to the daily and nightly bombing of Cologne, and with the growing insensitiveness to what the bombing meant in terms of human suffering went a steady deterioration of our civilization.

At the moment the whole world still reels under the shock of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. But—if we are still alive—we shall get used to atomic bombing as we have got used to the other kind. It

[4] This novel pictures the destruction of civilization on a world scale, caused by the swift multiplication of bacteria which render the soil sterile by destroying the nitrogen contained in it.

will be all in the day's work for us. From the Christian point of view, *this* is the end of civilization. It is absurd to think that although in time of war we have to dam up the springs of human pity, we can let them flow again when peace is restored. Unless we master the problem of the atomic bomb, peace will never come back. Two world wars, so far from ending war, have made it far more terrible and far more likely to happen. And may it not be true of us all that our war experiences have brought a permanent dulling of our sensibilities—a real deterioration of our civilization? We can have civilization or we can have modern warfare, but we cannot have both.

To think of the next war as being fought in defence of democracy and civilization is to think unrealistically. The battle for these is being fought *now*, and unless U.N.O. succeeds in controlling the exploitation of atomic power, the cause of democracy and civilization may well be lost before the next war breaks out. Is not the Report too naïve in supposing that democratic nations can be trusted with atomic secrets while totalitarian nations cannot? "All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely". There are no democratic exceptions to that rule. Already, the mere existence of atomic bombs somewhere in America is poisoning the springs of international relationships and deflecting the foreign policies of nations all over the world, and the continuance of our present suspense may be expected to obliterate the distinction between democracy and totalitarianism.

II

What does obedience to Christ mean to us Christians in a world threatened by atomic warfare? As the Report says (p. 57),

> the intolerable nature of the dilemma by which we (Christians) should be confronted by an outbreak of atomic warfare is an overwhelming reason for doing all in our power to further the proposal to eliminate weapons adaptable to mass destruction from the armaments of the nations.

As an instrument of international co-operation U.N.O. may be imperfect, but it is our Christian duty to back it for all we are worth. Every argument that induced us to support the League of Nations has today a double force. In spite of much that discourages and alarms us, there is still a possibility that an effective international control of the development of atomic power will be established, and for the realization of this possibility it is our duty to hope and to pray. But we must not make the mistake, too often made after the first World War, of identifying the Kingdom of God with the cause of world peace. Had the League of Nations succeeded in ridding the world of war, we should not as Christians be confronted with

the daunting problem of atomic weapons, but the tension between the Gospel and a God-denying world would remain.

The Report shows us very clearly that the Church has much more to do than to work for the abolition of atomic warfare. It must challenge in the name of Christ the dominant secularist philosophy of which atomic bombs are the inevitable outcome. It must recognize and interpret the significance of our modern scientific and technological achievement and proclaim that

> the only protection against the misuse of human gifts and powers is their free dedication to the service of their Giver (p. 79).

It may have

> a special mission . . . to offer to men a creative interpretation of their political and economic activities, and of the true ends after which in these activities they are, often unconsciously, striving. It has also the responsibility to sustain and nourish in the minds of those engaged in those activities the faith that their efforts are worth making as a service required by, and rendered to God (p. 80 f.).

And before it can do any of these things it must repent.

> Any thought that we who call ourselves Christians *have,* in our present apprehension and practice, the truth which the world desperately needs would be a fatal bar to the fulfilment of the mission that has been suggested (p. 81).

Not only for the world, but for the Church too, there must be a death and a resurrection. And here let us leave the Report, and remind ourselves of what the Gospel offers to our faith and hope.

A living faith in God is relevant to the world as it is and to us men and women as we are. Unless the Gospel is good news for the Atomic Age it is a delusion in every age. We all know those good people who believe that the Bible contains detailed predictions of current events. They find tanks in *Ezekiel,* fighter aeroplanes in *Isaiah,* and in other prophecies circumstantial and dated accounts of the rise of Russia to world power and the return of the Jews to Palestine. Their interpretations are absurd, for the Bible is not an *Old Moore's Almanac.* But their instinct is right. Certainly we do not find in the Bible any such preview of history as would make *Joel* or *Habakkuk* the key to the news columns of *The Times.* But if in the Gospel that is the heart of the Bible message we do not find every possibility of world history taken into account and set in the light of God's revelation of Himself in Christ, then our faith is indeed wishful thinking. That wars and rumours of wars, the rise and fall of empires, even the coming of the atom bomb itself, are already foreseen, mastered, and wrested to His saving purpose by God Who created and has redeemed the world—this is the very

substance of Christian faith and the only sure ground of our hopes and endeavours.

Now our preaching and evangelism presuppose a world as yet unconquered by the power of God. Our commando campaigns are sorties from a precariously held bridgehead. Our churches are an invading army hard pressed by counter-attacks and momentarily in retreat; and as we fight our rearguard action, our faith is sorely tried. But while there is truth in this picture and biblical warrant for it, it must be set against the background of a deeper, more inclusive truth. This world, after all, is God's world. Though it is "lost" to itself, He has not lost it. Our Christian warfare is not the invasion of a world still to be subdued, but a mopping-up operation in a war in which the decisive battle has already been won. The Cross of Christ is for us Christians more than an inspiration to self-sacrifice, more than the ground of a hope that love may at last triumph over evil by virtue of its power of enduring all things, even death, in the service of humanity. It is the sign that God is triumphing over evil *now*, and causing the wrath of man to praise Him. It gives us the assurance that He is sovereign Lord of the world, and that neither the sin of man or the contrariety of things can defeat His righteous and loving purpose. Whatever happens, God is never at a loss, never taken by surprise, but is always master of the situation and equal to the emergency. Whether expressed in this pedestrian way or in the glowing words of the Apostle, this is the Christian faith: "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord". If this was true in the first century, it is still true in the twentieth.

But what of the evil in the world? If we suppose that the evil in the world is due to the activities of a malevolent Being who was not created by God but has existed from all eternity as His Enemy; or that what opposes and partially frustrates the beneficent purposes of God is a certain intractability in the material with which He is working, so that God cannot bring to pass the perfection He desires but must be content with a second-best—on either supposition we have got rid of the *problem* of evil. Evil remains as an ugly fact, but its presence in the universe is no longer a mystery. Evil is a problem only for those who believe, with the Christian Church, that God is the Creator of the world, and that He created it *ex nihilo—out of nothing*. Creation "out of nothing" does not mean that God fashioned things out of a thin, plastic "nothingness", but on the contrary that there was *no* pre-existing material ready to His hand when God set about creating the world. If God's creation were like the "creating" of the human artist or craftsman, it would be

no surprise if flaws in the material made it impossible for Him to achieve His perfect design. But by affirming that God is really the Creator, the Christian Gospel raises the problem of evil in its acutest form. If in a world where God has created everything that exists we find evil, must we not say that God is responsible for the evil? Are we not on the horns of a dilemma here? Either God is not all-powerful or He is not all-good.

Relief from the problem of evil comes to men not from philosophy but from faith. The Gospel brings not a solution but a Saviour. We are not redeemed unless the Creator redeems us, and the Gospel assures us that the all-powerful is the all-loving too; that not for a single moment of time, not even when the heavens were darkened over Calvary, has the God of Love relaxed His hold on His world. From the extinction of a star in the Milky Way to the fall of a leaf in a Devonshire lane, nothing has happened or can happen in the universe or to it, except by God's permission or without being made an instrument of His loving purpose. Whatever tragedies lie hidden in the womb of Time, He has the measure of them all. God Himself is the source of that freedom which gives man the power to rebel against His Maker. God does not predetermine that man shall be a rebel rather than an obedient son, yet God does predetermine the effects of that rebellion. Thus the atom bomb threatens us with the destruction of civilization not only because man is a sinner, but because God is Wisdom, Righteousness, and Love. The responsibility for the use he makes of the discoveries of his science is man's own. But his knowledge and skill, the nature of atoms and their behaviour, the effects of nuclear fission—all these are what they are because God has made the world to be the instrument of His holy and gracious will. God does not suspend the law of gravitation so that the bomb does not fall, or deflect the bullet to save the murderer's victim. Even on Calvary the nails lacerated and the spear pierced. Yet God did not look on helplessly when His Son was crucified. He put forth His almighty power to make this greatest of crimes the means of the world's redemption. Today we face new and frightening possibilities of evil, but for God they are neither new nor frightening. He took them all into account before He created the world. Whatever happens now—whether it be the worst we fear or the best we hope for—God will wrest it to His saving purpose and overrule it for our eternal good.

This, then, is the faith by which Christians may live in the era of atomic power. It is not an easy faith. But if by the mercy of God it is ours, let us not exchange it for any lesser creed.

(*To be continued*)

RECOLLECTIONS OF A MINISTER

By H. C. Carter, M.A.

Some people had begun to call it the Round Chapel while we were children, but we thought them ignorant and a little vulgar. That is almost its official name by now. We knew it as Clapton Park Chapel and nothing else. It was there we were brought up. Yes, there, as truly as in our house in Lower Clapton High Road, where the Venus Pencil factory now stands. For home and Church were joined in our education indissolubly. Was not our father the Secretary? Had he not been that, or a deacon, from time immemorial? Were we not conscripted, before we had been long at day school, to help with the yearly assorting of the communion-cards for the large family of church-members? Their names became familiar to us. Did not nearly all the visiting preachers stay in our home? And how we classified them! We learned at what colleges they had been trained, and of those colleges we formed an estimate. Cheshunt had a high place. Of Mansfield, only just emerging, we suspended judgment. And then from time to time the deacons came to our house for their meeting, with a gorgeous tea—no rationing dreamed of. And when the pulpit was vacant, which happened twice in our childhood, what scrutiny we gave to the possibles! All the Church's affairs were a big part of our life.

Sunday services were no trial, just a natural part of the week's routine. Children's addresses had not been invented. But there was plenty to interest us. In my tender years my mother, when the tedious sermon-time came, would print the text, or part of it, on paper, and set me to pricking it out with a pin on a hassock. For the rest I got refreshment by observing the number and pattern of the organ-pipes from our far-back pew; still more from noticing the habits and guessing at the characters of the occupants of the seats near us. There was the old gentleman who intrigued me by his practice of keeping his eyes open during the prayers and shutting them for the sermon, the opposite of that usually followed. Then there was the younger man in the pew behind ours—he was W. E. Stevens, to become well known in Congregational circles later—who sang tenor, a vocal exercise strange and wonderful to my young ears.

We did not go to Sunday School. Father gave us a Bible lesson on Sunday afternoons before he went out visiting the sick. We sat round the dining table, where the dessert things still lingered (there was dessert only on Sundays), and he had the sense to know that if

we played about a little it did not mean that we were not listening. We had Sunday books, and Sunday toys. Sunday was a happy day.

Samuel Hepditch baptized us. Of him I remember little except that his white beard suggested all that was venerable. When W. J. Woods came as minister in 1887 I was twelve, and I began to listen to the preaching. Mr. Woods was interesting even to us younger ones. He had illustrations and anecdotes. He also had a handkerchief, kept by his side on the pulpit-front to wipe away his tears. He left us after five years to become Secretary of the Union of England and Wales, after he had rebutted a violent and not very well-deserved attack by Dr. Parker for alleged plagiarism. Our preachers had to be careful in those days how they cribbed their sermons. Henry Harries came in 1893 and stayed till long after I was grown up and had become a minister myself. Under him, while I was at boarding-school, I joined the Church as a member.

So the Church at Clapton Park, with its life welded into my childhood's home, was my nurse in the faith. Looking back on all the time before I went to college I find it surprising how entirely free it was for me of any kind of theological controversy or even questioning. It would be impossible for me to say under what kind of theology I was brought up. If it was Calvinistic, I have no recollection of our having been made afraid of hell, or lured by hopes of heaven. If there was a fundamentalist view of the Bible behind the teaching I got at home and Church, as there presumably was, it was never so rubbed into my mind as to raise for me any serious difficulty when I learned at college to treat Scripture historically and critically. The Sacraments were something to be done and delighted in, never to be theorized about. The Church was a Fellowship (that good word had not become stale in my young days) centred in a love for the Saviour, a natural outcome of that love for Him. As to ecclesiastical questions, we knew there were other religious bodies, notably the Church of England, to which many belonged, but it never occurred to us either to pity or despise them. They just happened not to be inside Congregationalism, the value of which we learned, not by study of its principles, but by experience of it. Roman Catholics certainly were outside the pale, but we knew little about them except what we gathered from history books.

My grandfather and father had both been at Mill Hill School, and I followed them there. For two years and a term I was under C. A. Vince as Headmaster. The School was then small, with less than 100 boys. It was a happy place. We knew nothing of fagging, nothing of corporal punishment, and not much of bullying. I am grateful for the compulsory Rugger, though I suffered a lot from getting knocked about at it when I was small. Cricket was not compulsory. For that I am sorry. Few small boys really like cricket,

but I believe it is good to make them play it. It must be learned young, and it is the king of games.

Vince was a fine scholar and a fine Christian, though not the kind of man to pull a school up when it was declining in numbers. He was shy with parents and loathed advertisement. He was the best preacher to boys I ever knew. His volume of sermons preached at Mill Hill, *Christian Conduct,* is priceless. He was succeeded by J. D. McClure, and I had the benefit of the first three years of his distinguished headmastership. He was all that Vince was not—extrovert as opposed to introvert is, I think, the right fashionable distinction. He soon made the school known. He had charm and ready wit, and skill as a teacher in almost any subject. His versatility was amazing. It was said that he could play a part on any instrument in the orchestra. He acquired a Mus. Doc. by a humorous work in oratorio form. He had been called to the Bar, taken the LL.D. of Cambridge, and had been a lecturer on astronomy among other things. He was a good preacher, with a delicate use of satire. He introduced liturgy into the school services and even some Latin hymns, shocking the good dissenting feelings of some of us boys. He had much to do with the making of our present hymn-book, and became chairman of the Congregational Union. It was exciting to be at the school in those days when he was learning his job as Headmaster.

From Mill Hill I went to Oxford as a scholar of Oriel. At Oriel I saw a good deal of L. R. Phelps, afterwards the Provost, having rooms on his staircase. He would take me for long Sunday walks into the country, with cold beef at an inn. Knowing me to be a Nonconformist he used kindly to talk to me about R. F. Horton, who seemed to be the only person of that eccentric way of thinking that he had ever known. The dons at Oriel did not love one another as they ought. There was a standing feud between Phelps and R. F. Hall, the Dean. The College was divided into Phelpsites and Deanites. I was a Deanite. Hall taught me Greek history, but I liked him all the same. He had a high voice, which had never broken, which I found attractive. On two points the College was united—devotion to soccer and contempt for rowing. Times have changed, for since then Oriel has been Head of the River. In our day we had more than half the team of soccer blues.

It was the Elizabethan age for the Union Society. Week by week we might hear in debate F. E. Smith, J. A. Simon, Hilaire Belloc, F. W. Hurst, Cyril Garbett, and others who became national figures. Belloc was the most eloquent. Frank Lenwood became President at the close of that palmy time. He was one of the few speakers who could change votes. He once carried a motion in favour of Total Abstinence, and another, when he was Junior

Librarian, dismissing *The Sporting Times* (the "Pink 'un") from the Society's reading rooms. He was well hated for his Puritan opinions, but won the Presidency in spite of them. After he had attained that high position, determined to show his colours, he spoke at the evangelistic open-air meeting at the Martyrs' Memorial. He refused to provide alcohol at the presidential dinner. E. C. Bentley, in his book, *Those Days,* refers to that incident (both he and I were present) as showing 'moral courage of the highest order.' Indeed it did. But those of us who knew Lenwood knew that he could not fail in such courage.

I must record my admiration and gratitude for the generous treatment Oriel gave me as a Nonconformist. I was told I need not attend Chapel unless I liked, and—perhaps in consequence—I did like, and went regularly at least on Sunday evenings, and came to know and respect the Anglican liturgy. I was invited to take communion if I wished. The present Bishop of Oxford would be distressed. And then, when I moved to Mansfield, though I had only got seconds in "Mods" and "Greats", they continued my scholarship, unasked, for an extra year. Let this be set down to the credit of the College of John Henry Newman.

In 1898 I went to Mansfield, feeling shut up to entering the ministry. When I left school I had intended to be a barrister. It was among Mansfield men that I found my best friends from my first days in Oxford, chiefest among them all Frank Lenwood, and it was certainly through those friendships that I formed the desire to be a minister.

Mansfield was then in the heyday of its early vigour. Dr. Fairbairn, just publishing his *Christ in Modern Theology,* was at the height of his power. We looked at him and listened to him with awe as a prodigy of knowledge and wisdom. He had by his side Vernon Bartlet, Buchanan Gray, and G. W. Thatcher, beginning to earn their reputation as scholars. It was a wonderful place to become part of. I am ashamed to think how little I learned, or I fear tried to learn, from the lectures. Fairbairn was too philosophical, Gray too erudite, Bartlet too dull. But from the men themselves, if not from their lectures, I learned lasting lessons. I got glimpses of what real scholarship meant and what Christian character was when combined with such scholarship.

During my time at Mansfield, as well as for my last two years at Oriel, I had 'digs' in the Old Parsonage, the lovely house next to St. Giles' Church on the Banbury Road. Seven of us, from Christchurch, Corpus and Oriel, had resolved to 'dig' together, and that was the only house we could find which could take us all. One of the seven was Edmund Harvey, the Quaker, who succeeded Canon Barnet as Warden of Toynbee Hall and was for many years a

Member of Parliament. Of the first seven some stayed only a year, some only two years, but their places were taken by other friends, and it became almost entirely a society of Mansfield men, notable among them being Frank Lenwood, L. H. Gaunt, and P. N. Harrison.

Before leaving College, seven of us Mansfield men (three of them from the Old Parsonage group) made a compact that, so long as it was humanly possible, we would meet for a few days annually to confer about our work and keep our friendship in repair. Two of the seven have left us in death, Frank Lenwood and J. Shaw Griffith (who became Principal of our theological college in Melbourne). But no one of all the seven has ever failed to attend the yearly gathering for any other reason than not being in England. We held this year our forty-sixth meeting. For a reason which I have no room to explain we call ourselves the "Context Club". It is surprising that, so far as we know, no other group from Mansfield or any other theological college has done a similar thing. It has been of incalculable value to us[1].

It was through one of those workings of God's providence which we call accidents that I became minister of Queen Street Church, Wolverhampton, on leaving College. After Dr. Charles Berry's sudden death, the Church was not able quickly to find a successor. They at length applied to Dr. Fairbairn to send them one of his men to take temporary charge. He sent Frank Lenwood, who worked there for six months. When Lenwood was about to leave he arranged a week of special services, and asked me, as his closest college friend, one year his junior, to help in conducting them. I did so without the shadow of a thought ever crossing my mind that any closer connexion with the Church was in prospect. To my intense surprise, not many days after the Mission was over, I read in *The Times* that I had been invited to succeed Dr. Berry. The letter conveying the invitation had not yet reached me. On that day, when my mind was bewildered by this announcement, I stood at a corner of Hyde Park on the edge of an enormous silent crowd and watched King Edward riding side by side with the Kaiser in Queen Victoria's funeral procession.

I accepted the Queen Street invitation, and inherited the great congregation that had been gathered there, not to disperse quickly, by Dr. Berry's Christian eloquence. It was not only a great congregation but a great Church fellowship to which I went—a parent Church with seven branches, to which an eighth was soon added. Perhaps it was well that I did not realize how great my responsibility was. It was undoubtedly too big a task for me. But I was supported

[1] The remaining members besides myself are W. M. Barwell, T. H. Cooper, G. E. Phillips, and P. N. Harrison.

by assistant ministers and a band of deacons whose tolerance and helpfulness were beyond all praise. My eight and a half years there were increasingly happy. From the Church there went out during my pastorate into our ministry Sidney Berry, Riches Lowe, W. J. McAdam, and T. S. Taylor. One of the colleagues whom I found in charge of one of the branch Churches, Henry Gardner, is still living in happy retirement after a long ministry at Thetford.

One well-known man outside our Church, who was kind to me in Wolverhampton, was Sir Henry Fowler, afterwards Lord Wolverhampton. He was our M.P. He called on me soon after I came to the town. He liked, I remember, to talk about hymns. The Wesleyans (they were that in those days before Methodist union) were rather proud of him, and it was wickedly said that for sixpence you could be admitted to Trinity Church to see the place where Sir Henry's head had marked the wall behind his seat. He was the most conservative of Liberals. He told me a good deal about the Cabinet in which he was serving after the great turnover of 1906. He had been nervous about the inclusion in it of John Burns, but was relieved to find that that fiery agitator seemed to have shed his socialism. The man he most feared for left wing tendencies was Leslie Harcourt. Lord Wolverhampton's life was written by his witty daughter, Ellen Thorneycroft Fowler. She said of him, 'Father always let us have his own way, and always gave us what he wanted'. We must be careful how we let our daughters be our biographers.

I thought I was settled at Queen Street for life. When Emmanuel Church, Cambridge, sent me a call out of the blue after Selbie had left them to be Principal of Mansfield, I refused it without hesitation. But when they repeated it six months later I felt bound to consider it seriously. I doubt if any minister and his wife can ever have felt it more of a wrench to leave a Church than we did on leaving Queen Street. But it seemed best to go. And so my long Emmanuel pastorate of nearly 34 years began.

Once again I had to stand in succession to the great. I had to try to fill the place occupied before me in turn by Forsyth and Selbie. One of my friends pungently said that after succeeding other people all my life so far, it was about time I began to succeed myself. Well, we can say nothing about success: success, as I heard Dr. Nairne once say, is not a churchman's word. But of the magnificence of the opportunity given me, and of the happiness I found in trying to make use of it, I am in no doubt. Cambridge soon became my loved home. There is no other town in the world so good to live in. Emmanuel became my loved Church. There is no other Church in the world so good to serve in. And the University soon claimed my affection. I joined Christ's College and it showed me generous

kindness, not least through its present master, Dr. Charles Raven, whom I am proud to number among my real friends. As an Oxford man, when it comes to anything so serious as the boat race, of course my loyalty to my *alma mater* is firm. But I have almost come to feel myself a Cambridge man.

Cambridge, when I first knew it, was not very different from what it is now, except that there was no boat of any kind on the river on Sundays. There were two lines of one-horse trams running—very slowly. Bus services were in their infancy. A resident on the Hills Road was complaining to a friend of mine that there was a bus to take him into the town only once an hour. "But surely", my friend said, "you don't want to go into town more than once an hour".

Emmanuel Church was fortunate in including among its people some splendid seniors from the University, and in being able to draw into its life many men and women undergraduates. Nevertheless it was, and remains, a Church made up mostly of unacademic people. The dons who belonged to it were certainly among the very best of its members, for to be a practising nonconformist is hardly yet a 'done' thing among those who sit at high-tables. When men like Professor Sir German Sims Woodhead, Professor Courtney Kenny, Dr. Reynolds Green, Dr. Henry Bond, Professor J. Holland Rose, and Bernard Manning, to speak only of some who have gone from us, persisted in their loyal adherence to our Church, it could only be because they believed wholeheartedly in what it stood for. But the Church is not made up of such as these, nor of the ever-changing student population, though that has contributed much to its life[2]. Like any other of our churches, it consists mainly of very ordinary people—tradesmen, lodging-house keepers, clerks, artisans—'not many mighty, not many noble'. And how beloved a fellowship it is to us who have been of it!

Outside Free Church circles I had some interesting acquaintances. One was 'Q' (Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch), whom I knew fairly well through his friends Bernard Manning and Freddy Brittain (Manning's and Q's biographer), of Jesus College. I was told that I was the only teetotaller for whom 'Q' had any respect. He was the best of story-tellers and, until he became inaudible, the best of lecturers. His ready wit was amazing. Noticing outside the Church which was used by Toc H a banner inscribed 'I will go anywhere, so long as it be forward: David Livingstone', he said, "I should like to add, 'So say all of us: the Gadarene Swine' ". Edward Woods, now Bishop of Lichfield, was a good friend. He was vicar of Holy Trinity, Simeon's Church, but not a Simeonite in his views.

2 The University Congregational Society, closely associated with the Church, would require a separate article for a description of its influence.

He led in the founding of a United Council of all the Anglican and Free Churches of the town. Our relations with the Anglicans were generally most friendly, though the Vicar of Little St. Mary's, the Church which is next-door neighbour to ours, once lodged a protest with the Bishop when Charles Raven, then the young Dean of Emmanuel College, preached in our pulpit. In that same Church, later on, special prayers were sometimes offered for our work and for my ministry.

Within the Free Churches, but outside our own Church, were some who were a continual help to me. Especially in the early years of my pastorate T. R. Glover gave much to me by his friendship. I heard *The Jesus of History* delivered as lectures before it won its immense influence in book form in the student world and beyond it. But my debt was greatest to that remarkable quartet of Presbyterian Professors at Westminster College, Dr. John Skinner, the Principal, Dr. Oman, Dr. Anderson Scott, and Dr. Carnegie Simpson.

Dr. Skinner was the best older friend I ever had. After his retirement I used to spend some hours with him every week. I could pour out my thoughts to him, my loves and hates, without fear of being misunderstood or of being held to anything I had said before. And he would talk away to me, though he had the reputation of being usually uncannily silent. I wish I could describe him fairly, but I am too prejudiced by affection. He was a great scholar. His *Prophecy and Religion* stands among the greatest pieces of work of the present century on the Old Testament. He was humble as a child, though he could be devastatingly critical. He was a quiet but staunch pacifist. I treasure a copy of the address he gave his students on the outbreak of the first great war.

Dr. Oman was very good to me, and it was always a joy to be in his house. Conversation with him was mostly one-sided. He talked and you listened. He was the most solitary of thinkers. Of recent English theologians he is perhaps the only one who can be said to have had a school of disciples. Dr. Anderson Scott was a very loving friend. I saw much of him during his last years, when the burden of his retirement from teaching weighed heavily on him. I never knew anyone to be so sad at having to retire. Among other greater services he did for me was to stimulate and increase my passion for Anthony Trollope's novels. Dr. Carnegie Simpson, happily still living, though an invalid, was the soul of kindness. He was always that to everybody. He used to complain to me that his reputation was as an ecclesiastical politician, while his real interest was in religion. He was happier in the success of his little book, *The Fact of Christ,* translated into many languages, than in the fame he won as the biographer of Rainey, that prince of Scottish ecclesiastics, or as leader of the Free Church side in the conversations

with the Bishops after the 1920 Lambeth Conference. I thought him one of the best of preachers. He conducted a week's Mission at Emmanuel, in which we joined with the Presbyterians, and did lasting good by his addresses.

Towards the end of 1914, when the war had been going on a few months, there came together in Cambridge a miscellaneous group of Christians who could not believe in the rightness of war. Among them were Richard Roberts, W. E. Orchard, Maude Royden, Leyton Richards, Henry Hodgkin, and others of well-known names. I was present at the meeting. At that time there was such a spirit of tolerance that the members of the Conference were put up in Trinity Hall and allowed to meet in the University Arts Theatre. There resulted the formation of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, of which I became a member almost from the beginning. The mood of tolerance did not last for long. Soon the meetings of our Cambridge branch had to be in secret and their *rendezvous* often to be changed at the last minute.

Our Church weathered the storm of war. There were a good many conscientious objectors in our circle, especially among the students. I was never a pugnacious pacifist, nor I fear a very brave one, but it was plain what I stood for, and as the war went on feelings ran higher and higher. The leading deacons of the Church, good patriots, became troubled. Before two years had passed I felt obliged to hand the Church my resignation. To my surprise, by an overwhelming majority at a church meeting over which Dr. Selbie was called in to preside, they refused to accept it and passed a vote of confidence. From that time, in spite of the differences of conviction about war, the Church's life has been peaceful and happy. Its harmony was not disturbed during the second great war.

In 1939 I announced my intention to retire in the following year. When war broke out the Church asked me to stay on, which I did until the beginning of 1944. For six years before my retirement I had a younger colleague in the ministry of the Church—John Farrar (now of Macclesfield). It was, I think for both of us, a very happy partnership. It is often said to be an excellent thing for a young man to begin his ministry as assistant to an older one. I can say from my experience that it is most excellent for an older minister to have a young one by his side, not so much to lighten his labours as to keep him up to the scratch.

'The lines have fallen unto me in pleasant places'. Now I have a place in the pew, which I do not stay away from except to preach elsewhere, and I have a minister of my own: two more good things added. No man in the Congregational ministry can have been more favoured than I have been. I hope I am not unmindful of my privileges, nor ungrateful for them to the Giver of all good.

BEETHOVEN

AS A READER AND AS A MAN OF RELIGION

By A. M. Henderson, L.R.A.M., A.R.C.M.

The experiences which contribute to the making of a great personality are of interest to every thoughtful person, for the art of living is the great business of life. The lover of literature likes to know what authors have helped, inspired, or refreshed his friend; and in the same way it is only natural that the student and lover of Beethoven should be interested to know what books were the friends and companions of this great man. Strangely enough, the standard biographies give us but little light on this interesting subject, and my own notes for this short article were made in the first case from reading the Beethoven *Letters* (Kalischer's Ed.), Breuning's *Erinnerungen aus seiner Jugendzeit,* and Nohl's *Beethoven's Brevier,* also from many visits to the Beethoven House at Bonn, when I had the privilege of examining some of the volumes at first hand.

Beethoven had only a small library, but it was a good and representative one. The books which it contained give many indications that they were read by a thoughtful man, for they are full of pencil markings and marginal notes. The worn condition of many of them also indicates beyond a doubt that they were read frequently, and much in the evening hours. Like many book-lovers before and since his time, Beethoven enjoyed occasional reading in bed, especially in the evenings. On these occasions, and particularly when much interested in his book, he was in the habit of placing a couple of candles near his bed, making a cup of coffee with his spirit-lamp, and then settling down to enjoy a night's reading! The drops of wax that are noticeable in some of his books show unmistakably that they were carelessly laid by the side of the lights while he either drank his coffee or attended to its preparation.

It cannot fail to interest every Beethoven student to know what the great man read, for doubtless his books are so many keys to the mind of the master. If a library is to be compared to a company of friends—a company of silent friends that are every ready to speak to us—it must be of interest to the reader to know what silent friends Beethoven deemed worthy of a place on his shelves.

Of the books he possessed at the time of his death there were the works of Shakespeare, Homer's *Odyssey* and *Iliad* (in the translation of J. H. Voss), Sturm's *Observations Concerning the Works of God in Nature,* Goethe's Poems, *Wilhelm Meister* and *Faust,* Schiller's Dramas and Poems, selected volumes of Greek and Latin

Classics (in German translations), Plato (*The Republic*), Aristotle, Plutarch, Pliny, Euripides, Horace, and others, a copy of the Bible and Apocrypha, and Burney's *General History of Music*, the gift, it is believed, of an English admirer.

Unfortunately only a few of the above volumes were preserved and can still be seen—four volumes of the Shakespeare works, Homer's *Odyssey*, and Sturm's *Observations*. Most of the others have disappeared. Breuning, in his beautiful and touching description of the last days of Beethoven's life, says that the relatives sold everything with undue haste. Thus many of his books were scattered, perhaps never to be found again. The few volumes of Shakespeare which are known to have been his are full of pencil markings and annotations. Quite a number of these markings are seen in *Othello*, in *Romeo and Juliet*, in *Much Ado about Nothing*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *Merchant of Venice*. In the latter play not less than eighteen places are marked, and Portia's words,

> How far that little candle throws his beams!
> So shines a good deed in a naughty world,

are also copied in his diary.

By the side of the great Elizabethan dramatist, Beethoven next admired Homer, the *Odyssey* pleasing him most. He had the standard German translation by Voss, printed in Hamburg in 1781. The book itself was bound in leather, and, judging from its appearance, was diligently read and re-read. It is this book mainly which is marked with wax drops, showing that Beethoven read it at night as well as by day. That the *Odyssey* pleased Beethoven is not to be wondered at, for it is still a book that fascinates and attracts all who have imagination and sensibility. In the *Letters* we find an interesting commentary on the relative influence of Goethe and Schiller:

> Goethe's poems exert a great power over me, not only because of their contents, but also because of their rhythms. I am stimulated to compose by this language, which builds itself up to higher orders as if through spiritual agencies, and bears in itself the secret of harmonies.

On the other hand, he says of Schiller:

> Schiller's poems are difficult to set to music. The composer must be able to rise far above the poet. Who can do that in the case of Schiller? In this respect Goethe is much easier.

One of Beethoven's favourite books was Sturm's *Observations Concerning God's Works in Nature* (*Betrachtungen über die Werke Gottes in der Natur*), his own copy filled with pencil marking and underlining; and, not satisfied with this, many passages are also copied into his diary. This work was written by a Protestant pastor, and contains, in addition to devotional passages, many descriptions of the beauties of Nature as well as of works of art. The book

contained a meditation for every day in the year, and was evidently read by many persons daily, in much the same way as many Christian people now read a passage from the Bible or a "daily portion" of some helpful kind.

Beethoven had two editions of this book; the one he usually read from was published in Hamburg in 1811. He read his Sturm diligently, possibly as an act of devotion, and still more likely because of the author's many allusions to the beauty of Nature. As already indicated, the copy is covered with pencil notes and markings, evidence of how this simple, devotional writer influenced the great musician. This was probably Beethoven's favourite book, and we know that he recommended it to priests for distribution among the people. He saw the hand of God in every manifestation of Nature and in all natural phenomena. God was to him the Supreme Being whom he hymned in the choral symphony in the words of Schiller: "Brothers, beyond yon starry canopy there must dwell a loving Father". Beethoven's relationship to God was like that of a child to a loving father in whom he confides all his joys and sorrows.

To give readers a better idea of Sturm's book, I quote a couple of passages marked by Beethoven, and also copied into his diary:

> In praise of Thy goodness I must confess that Thou didst try with all Thy means to draw me to Thee. Sometimes it pleased Thee to let me feel the heavy hand of Thy displeasure. Sickness and misfortune didst Thou send upon me to turn my thoughts to Thee. One thing only, O Father, do I ask: cease not to labour for my betterment. In whatsoever manner it be let me turn to Thee and become fruitful in good works.

Again from the diary, 1818:

> With tranquillity, O God, will I submit myself to Thy will, and place all my trust in Thine unalterable mercy and goodness.

Beethoven's intense love of Nature is well known. Especially as increasing deafness came upon him, and he felt more and more cut off from his fellow men, he found solace and comfort in the woods and fields. In his walks in the country he found the themes and motives for his symphonies; the birds, brooks, and trees all sang to him, and he has himself recorded this for us. In a letter of July, 1814, he writes:

> In the country it seems as if every tree said to me: 'Holy! holy!' Who can give complete expression to the ecstasy of the woods!

Again, in a letter to Madame Streicher at Baden in the autumn of 1817 he writes:

> When you reach the old ruins, think that Beethoven often paused there; if you wander through the mysterious pine forests, think that Beethoven often composed there.

What a pity Beethoven did not know English well enough to read Wordsworth; he would have been a poet after his own heart.

One only requires to read the letters, the diaries, and notebooks to realize how deeply religious a man Beethoven was; his religion may not have been according to the creeds of the Church, but there is no doubt at all as to its sincerity and reality.

The following passage from his diary is only one confirmation of his religious faith; a faith in God, in which he found strength and consolation:

> O God, Thou art my refuge, my rock, my all. In Thee do I place my trust. Thou know'st my heart; Thou know'st all things. Increase my faith, and grant me strength to bear the burden[1] laid upon me with fortitude, and without bitterness.

Beethoven had a deep regard for the New Testament and its teaching, and especially for the words of our Lord, which are frequently quoted by him in his letters. To certain near and intimate friends he also recommends particular passages.

It is in reading the letters, especially, that we are impressed by the sincerity and depth of the great composer's faith.

I close this short sketch with a final quotation from Sturm's *Observations*, a passage well marked, and copied in his diary:

> Nature is a glorious school for the heart! 'Tis well; I shall be a scholar in this school, and bring an eager heart to her instruction. Here I shall learn wisdom, the only wisdom that is free from distaste; here I shall learn to know God, and find a foretaste of Heaven in His knowledge. Among these occupations my earthly days shall flow peacefully along until I am accepted into that world where I shall no longer be a student, but a knower of wisdom.

[1] As readers will be aware, the burden referred to by Beethoven was that of his deafness.

A Book of Family Worship (Epworth Press, 5s.) contains a cycle of prayer drawn from all Christian centuries for the family and covering three months, a systematic series of Bible readings for each day and suggestions for the daily devotional use of the Methodist Hymn Book. This book was widely and constantly used before publication, and so has been admirably adapted for reviving worship in Christian homes.

United Prayers (James Clarke, 3s. 6d.) is a short, well conceived collection of prayers for corporate use in schools by the former Chaplain of Taunton School, the Rev. McEwan Lawson. Well known and original material is arranged in three groups for junior, middle and senior schools, ending with a treasury of general prayers.

KENNETH G. OGILVIE.

A CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE FOR HUMAN KNOWLEDGE

By Reginald A. Smith

There are few more common themes in literature, mythology, and even the children's play than the impiety of not knowing where to stop. The first great corporate adventure recorded in the Old Testament is the attempt to build a tower whereof the top should reach unto heaven. Æsop's frog bursts in trying to be as big as a bull. Fortune pours riches into the beggar's sack and they turn to dust when his clamour for still a little more causes too much strain for the old material. Tolstoy's peasant gets only his six-foot grave because his long day's race to encompass the land that shall be his own is prolonged by his cupidity beyond his heart's capacity. Kindred themes are found in Hans Andersen's Wicked Prince and Snow Queen. And the Tower of Babel is built again in every nursery that has a sufficient supply of wooden bricks. The oldest and most jaded cannot resist *this* game's appeal but stand tensely by while trembling hands place one more brick on the already swaying "skyscraper". But while the very young will repeat the effort again and again, maturity and worse get bored after one or two collapses. The awful certainty has gone deep into their spirits. The tower will always crash in the end. Always things find their limit—and at times it seems that it makes no difference whether the endeavour is pursued in the spirit of goodness or is one more overweening empire of the megalomaniac.

Crude logic, both in and out of the nursery, sometimes revolts against this seemingly unreasonable inexorability. When we have built so high and gone so far, why should the one more brick, the one more step, make all the difference? Man's most persistent failure to grasp the lessons of his experience is the failure to know that reality inheres not only in the atoms and integers but equally in their cumulative relationships in time and space. He flaunts his skyscrapers, builds his unsinkable ships, and plants his 'Hitler's oaks', but of every particular thing it is true that 'God has appointed the bounds of its habitation'. When those bounds are being reached, some adaptation more fundamental than mere extensions of the old kind have to be made if there is to be an extension of the permanence. That being achieved, we have not merely extension, but also enrichment. Our faith demands that we should never doubt, however complete the crisis, that until the final building is transcended in the full perfection of eternity, that further principle is always waiting to be revealed.

Mythology and the more primitive forms of religion have believed that the gods (and even God) were jealous and fearful of man's attainment and would always intervene to keep it within bounds. Few of us even today can escape entirely from the superstitious fear of the slip between cup and lip, the fear of tempting fate by being too successful. Even Jesus told the story of the man whom God called fool on the night of his harvest home. But one thing is clearly true of Jesus by all the testimonies, and is echoed by all the New Testament writers. His faith, so far from discouraging man's aspiring, calls man to the supreme aspiration of becoming a Son of God and planting the complete reign of God in the realm of the material as it prevails already in the Eternal and in the kingdom of dedicated Spirits. We are increasingly sure that God has given us all things richly to enjoy, and that one of man's impieties has always been the sequestering of those gifts and the greed and failures of organization that mean waste and neglect of their present and potential abundance.

At the same time there is clear evidence of the harmful consequences of excess and of failure to keep those outward gifts pregnant with their due spiritual significance. What shall it profit a man if he conquer the whole world and die in the conquering? Or if he gather the whole world's riches and lose his sense of the eternal values which alone can finally satisfy? One of the affirmations we may rightly draw from the parable of the talents is that we cannot multiply too much the earthly gifts of God so long as we do it for God and our fellows, and for ourselves only in Him. Even here, commendation is not wholly on quantity. Twice two counts as much as twice five. Only stagnation is condemned. Possessions are an instrument of life, and it is in the life and not in the possession that the value ultimately lies. It is indeed clear both from ancient injunction and our own experience that with material possession, individual fame, and control over other people, there must be actual limitation and renunciation if health is not to be impaired—the health of the single person and of society—and if values are not to be destroyed that are greater than those created. Is this true also of the things of the mind? May there not be a point at which man should cease his quest for knowledge and be content to *wonder* at the mysteries that lie behind the experiences life has vouchsafed—and still more should restrain his lust for power over nature?

In the ages of faith the majority did not hesitate to give assent to this suggestion. But there have always been some, and their number has vastly grown in the more recent centuries, who have said confidently that to know the secrets of the universe is a part of the knowledge of God, and that to draw back from the quest for knowledge is to turn our back on His light. There is no reason to deny

that now, but there are certain qualifications that Christians must make. The first is that no more with knowledge than with material possessions and sensory enjoyments is mere quantity or even variety most to be desired. A little knowledge becomes wisdom, and even divine wisdom, if it is unified and kindled by the understanding of essential principles and relationships, while the most massive knowledge may be mere vanity and folly (to say nothing of 'vexation of spirit') without it. Any sound educationist, scholar, or artist will agree that accumulation without proper assimilation is valueless and even dangerous. And there is no proper assimilation into the true spirit of man except for those who know and love God. It is right to know all the ways of God in nature, but the only sufficient motive for knowing is that we may love and worship Him the more fully and do His will the more completely and effectively. Without knowledge of God, any knowledge we have—even if we consider it simply as knowledge, apart from any thought of love or goodness—is imperfect.

Moreover, the claim that is made upon us by love overrides the claim of knowledge. We may not do anything in our search for knowledge that would violate the love we share with God for His creation. Among the consequences of that is some limitation of our knowledge to theory and speculation as distinct from experimental certainty. By the method of experiment man has vastly increased his knowledge of the works of God and has been greatly helped in doing the will of God. But if the experiment threatens to destroy the values of God we must rest content with knowing the various possibilities we can deduce from such experience as we have. It may be that God will vouchsafe a fuller revelation to us in other ways. If not, or until He does, we glorify Him by our faith.

I recently found this thought amusingly but reverently expressed in a novel—a slender but beautiful piece of work by Elizabeth Goudge called *City of Bells*. There are two children, a boy and a girl, living with a great saint who is a canon in a Cathedral city. The boy is the old man's orphaned grandson, the girl his adopted child. This is one of the incidents of their life together. The boy is meeting the girl on her return from a journey, and tells her of his guinea-pig, newly acquired. Teasing as brothers will, he declares that if he picks it up by the tail, its eyes will drop out. A stranger to guinea-pigs, she asks, 'Is it true?' but begs in tenderness for the guinea-pig's eyesight that he will not do it.

'If I don't I can't tell whether it's true or not. Grandpa says it's a splendid opportunity for the exercise of simple faith. But I don't know what he means'.

The little girl supplies the answer. 'He means not to do it!'

Must we always think of faith as inferior to experimental knowledge? We are promised that our faith shall at last be lost in sight, in total knowledge—knowing as we are known. In that final knowledge, our partial knowledge no less than our faith must be transcended. Meantime there is a special glory in acceptance of a noble idea by faith and in refraining from an act of verification because it would involve a denial of love. "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed".

Nor is faith without its special joy. Our tormented minds will often find as complete a rest in seeing that certain things might be possible in certain ways as they would find in the experimental demonstration of precisely what does happen and how it comes about. There is joy in the poetic conception no less than in the scientific demonstration.

This does not mean that we must cease from experiment and demonstration when these are possible without danger of sinning against the love of God. It does mean that we should be more critical in our assessment of the importance of certain demonstrations and of the value of some of the powers and material knowledge and enrichment that experimental knowledge may bring to us. It gives to us a Christian principle for the control of science—a principle that carries us far beyond the obvious humanist judgment that it would be sinful to wreak destruction with atomic force merely for the sake of gaining knowledge. The Christian principle would require us to evaluate the consequences of mechanical efficiency of the multiplication of speed, the increasing conquest of distance. Is the leisure, the material enrichment, the enlarged experience such as will benefit mankind, such as men and women are ready to absorb? Will they enrich the life of man's spirit? If not, our Christian principle may well bid us hold back from creating them until we have first prepared the way. In modern times men and women have lived on the principle of experience and achievement at any price. The Christian principle would have us put love first—but love linked with a venturesome faith, taking great risks ourselves but refusing to jeopardize others.

We can see this principle at work in the gospel records of how Jesus used His powers and in all his reported answers to the temptations. He would not turn stones into bread for Himself, but he would feed the multitude stranded and hungry in a desert place, extending the usefulness of the loaves that were food already. He would not throw Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple because to seek for a sign was the mark of an evil and adulterous generation. It was not for man to create dangerous situations without the basis in necessity, just to see what God would do. That was

not true faith. But faced with youth's untimely death, and with the halt, the lame, and the blind, and all manner of diseases, He would stake everything on His belief in the loving power of God. Least of all would he fall down and worship Satan—calling good evil, and evil good—to win world dominion for Himself. 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve'.

Whatever we may be led to believe about the historicity of these stories, they contain lessons that are given for our learning by the inspiration of God.

The Temptation story gives us the principle negatively. St. Paul's hymn to love gives it positively. Our faith, St. Paul knows, can remove mountains, as our scientific hypotheses point the way to achievement. But there is no joy and no virtue in moving mountains unless we move them for love's sake. Without love—and ultimately without our love of God and knowledge of His love for all His creatures—there is not only no virtue and only a vitiated joy in all our knowledge and achievement, there is positive and growing danger to the very foundations of tolerable human life. No terrors and no sentimental tenderness will restrain man permanently from the most extreme violence and cruelty. There is Satan as well as God in the core of our spirits unless we know at least something of the exquisite aching joy of His majesty and His love. The nobler and greater a man is in human terms, the more powerfully will he feel the dread fascination of the plunge into the abyss, the jump from the pinnacle of the temple, the bargain with the devil for power over his fellows. No abstraction, whether State or humanity, can confront us with anything greater than our individual selves. Unless we see the consummation in the eternal, we know that humanity consists only of individuals, and none of them has any more imperative claim on us than the clamorous impulses of our nature. Abstractions may enslave the weak (the 'Superman' will use them to do so) but they cannot bind those who feel the pull of the cosmic tides. The needs of these can be met by nothing less than the worship and service of God, which alone is nobler and more worthy of invincible loyalty than our own will to power or appetite for experience. Without God, 'one crowded hour of glorious life is worth an age without a name'. 'Better to rule in hell than serve in heaven'. Knowing God, we shed illusions about the Superman and know that he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.

The Spirit of Love will continue to lead us into all truth, even though it bars the way to some experiments. It is a scientific as well as spiritual fact that love will find the way, for with its intense realization of the right objectives it suggests the fruitful hypotheses. Science, so some would crudely tell us, has abolished the idea of

revelation. Yet there is revelation, a spontaneous, inexplicable act of creation, in every direct perception of the facts of nature, every perception of unity and difference, by which we make our deductions and our inductive leaps.

Moreover, in the spirit and the buried mind of man, there may well be (there do indeed seem to be) clues to reality that penetrate where physical methods, in the nature of things, cannot reach. Such revelations will transcend and illuminate but never contradict the evidence that comes to us from our humble submission to the facts of nature as we perceive them by the ordinary physical and sensory means, and from sound reasoning based on those facts. If there seems to be contradiction, we are called to patient and humble research and reflection until we see at least the possibility of a reconciliation.

Thus led by the Spirit of Love, men and women will often see and know without experience better than some whose experience is greater. Man cannot love God whom he hath not seen if he loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, but if he is brought in faith to build from love of his fellows to love of God, he can love his unseen brother—the brother on the other side of the world whom others who have seen him fail to love because they do not sufficiently love God.

A science directed by the love of God and man will pay increasing attention to this mental and spiritual approach to knowing. Even there it will not strain for extreme and fantastic experience, but will wait for the gentle leading of the Spirit—or for those seemingly sudden illuminations or crises which come unsought—not from stern effort and anxious thought (though they may at times lay these upon us), but from a calm and trustful sensitiveness to all that comes within our range. It will include a full appreciation of the eternal beauty and fitness of the slow unfolding of our powers in correspondence with our present and immediate surroundings, but it will not hold back in fear from any new experience that reveals itself as possible, necessary, and consistent with love.

This true science of Christ is the only lasting answer to the dangerous human potentialities of which the invention of the atomic bomb is the latest evidence. But long before the atomic bomb was dreamed of, it was the one sure way of pursuing knowledge without weariness, despair, and dishonour. It is the way not of the Tower of Babel, which would assail the throne of God by adding brick to brick: it is the way of God's invitation to Sonship—which begins with the trembling joy of knowing His presence in everyday things, of knowing that the Kingdom of God is within us and can never be realized externally except in the power of that living nucleus in awakened and dedicated souls.

THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

By William E. Wilson, B.D.

For a quarter of a century there has been an organized movement working for Christian Unity. It does not include the Roman Church, but that is only because the Roman Church will not join it. It includes all British, American and Continental Non-Roman Christian bodies, and the Eastern Orthodox Churches, as well as all the new Non-Roman Churches in Asia and Africa, the products of the last century and a half of intensive missionary work. It is therefore world-wide; and its council is formed of some of the most outstanding leaders of the Church taken from every section of it and from all the leading nations.

The gains of this movement are plain and considerable. The rancour and bitterness, which fifty years ago frequently characterized on both sides the relations of Dissent and Establishment, are almost entirely a thing of the past. We are all learning to work together, and, what is more important, are learning to recognize one another as brothers in Christ. But while relations are immensely improved, unity has not been achieved. The object of this paper is to point out that further progress toward unity cannot be achieved without a more radical consideration of what the basis of that unity is. For at present it seems still to be the general conviction that its basis must be in some form or other an agreement on three points: Creeds, Orders of Ministry, and Sacraments.

I would maintain that none of these is the basis, or even part of the basis of unity. Each has historically been the cause of repeated divisions. None is central enough to constitute the basis of unity. All are rather outworks thrown up to defend the central position. Just as the Pharisees of our Lord's day, in order that the commandments of the law should nowise be disobeyed, built a hedge about it; that is, set up a series of regulations, which were intended to prevent any transgression, so, as it seems to me, the Churches generally—for all have done it more or less—have built up systems of protection for the Faith itself. Thus they have endeavoured to state the intellectual content of the Faith in Creeds and Confessions; to provide for order, continuity, discipline and the preservation of tradition by the establishment of Orders of Ministry, and to supply helps to the spiritual life by Sacraments. I make no suggestion that these actions were in any way wrong. All that was provided had a useful place. The wrong came when they were mistaken for the Faith itself, or at least treated as if they were so mistaken. Agreement is necessary on the Faith itself, not on any one of the outworks set up for its defence

and help. The latter have been changed and modified in process of time far more than most people realize. Changes have indeed generally been so gradual that they were mostly unnoticed. The Vincentian Canon, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,* if rigorously applied to the development of Catholicism, would produce strange results. Would it not exclude the pre-Pauline Church and cast doubt on the orthodoxy of the Apostle himself? And could pre-tridentine and post-tridentine Catholicism both pass it?

Is there then nothing that all through remains the same? There is, but it is not necessarily definable in terms of the three points mentioned. It is another something, easily recognized, but not easy to define. It is seen in life. The outstanding Christian saints show it. Across the chasms of time and space we can see it in those of old, and equally in more modern times or in our own day it can be recognized. Thus Francis of Assisi and John Woolman, differing widely on the three points mentioned, yet in life and spirit are manifestly akin, and one may be certain, would, if they met one another, at once recognize their kinship. There is a similar likeness between Ignatius Loyola and General Booth, though it may be doubted if the strength of their antagonistic dogmatic pre-suppositions would not prevent their recognition of one another this side of eternity. But we can recognize in both an overwhelming passion for complete loyalty to Christ expressed in strikingly similar ways.

Why were William Temple and Charles Gore as much revered in the Free Churches as in the Anglican? Assuredly not because Free Churchmen agreed with them on the three points, but because they discerned in them this other something. Why have the leaders of this movement towards unity insisted that the Society of Friends should send representatives to their Council? Certainly not because Quakers agree, or are likely to agree, on these points, but because in them is recognized this other something.

This other something is, I maintain, the Faith itself; not its intellectual expression in creed, nor the defences and helps of Orders and Sacraments that have been built up around it. This Faith itself is not, and cannot be, identical with a creed. It is a life; a fact, an experience. It has, of course, to be indicated by words and phrases. How else can we speak of it? But it can only be expressed in Life, and it is therefore imperative that we never regard any particular form of words as so completely indicating it that it runs any danger of being taken as its exact equivalent.

No! Words can only indicate it, not express it. It is therefore desirable to put it in several different forms, admitting that none completely gives it. It may even be that some would reject a form of words which others thought true. Something more must therefore be said about it before even trying to indicate it in any form of

words. Here then are three general propositions about this fact, this experience, this life. *First* it is divine. If we speak of it, as we do, as "our experience", we do not mean that it is our individual private possession. Far less do we mean that it is only our own inner state. It comes from God, is directed to God, and is also directed to our fellow men. For breaking down our individualistic isolation it tends to unite us with all others who have it, and works in us the desire to bring all men into it. *Secondly* as a fact it is rooted in history. Its prevalence now amongst us and in every country on the face of the earth reaches back into the great Judæo-Christian tradition, whose record is in the Bible, and its great expansion from a merely national into a universal fact had its source in Jesus of Nazareth. He deepened, made clearer and made capable of universal expansion what before Him had been scarcely more than a national peculiarity in religion. *Thirdly* He is the supreme example of it in this world, and in one form or another all, who profess and call themselves Christians, derive this fact, this experience, this life from Him.

These propositions, upon which all who call themselves Christians will agree, go to show that this other something, though it may not be exactly definable, is no mere vague religiosity, but is a recognizable entity distinguishable from other religious faiths.

So far, I think, we can all go together. When we try to go further differences arise. Some would assert that apart from Jesus this life and experience cannot occur. Others, with Justin Martyr, would hail not only Abraham, Moses and the saints of the Old Testament, but also Socrates and Plato as Christians before Christ, and would probably add Zoroaster and Buddha. Others again would say that in a sense both statements were true, for the Spirit that worked in Jesus had also inspired them, though to a lesser degree. Or, as Dr. Inge put it, "The voice of God within us speaks in the tones of Jesus of Nazareth".

Again, most of us believe that this Jesus of Nazareth is verily God manifested in human life, and that we owe to Him far more than illumination and example, that divine power comes to us from Him, and that He lives in us. Others hesitate to go as far as this, maintaining that His teaching and example are not perhaps all that we owe to Him, but certainly the main part of it, and that we dare not assert that He is one with God in any deeper sense than moral unity.

Now, especially in the second instance, we have both great agreement and great disagreement. We cannot pass over the disagreement as trifling. It is important. It is important for thought and for expression in words. It is less important in life and experience. No doubt it will be objected that mistaken ways of thinking lead to impoverishment of experience and to lives unworthy

of our Faith. It is true that this may and sometimes does happen. But it is also true that until these are manifested we have no right to refuse the Christian name to those who claim it. It is true that those of whom we speak do not trace their faith to Jesus in as complete a form as do the Orthodox, but they do trace it to Him. He is for them the supreme example and teacher. Two sayings of Jesus seem to apply: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" seems to show that He regarded reverence for Himself as a less urgent matter than following His guidance. And "Let both grow together until the harvest" suggests that judging prematurely of others' standing is no part of our duty. Therefore until then these, who claim to follow Jesus, either desert Him for another Leader, or obviously fall away from Him, we have no right to refuse them the Christian name nor to attempt to exclude them from His Church. Actually we cannot do the latter. Christ can work through them to His glory and to our shame, as He worked through the Arian Ulphilas in the conversion of the Goths, and through the Nestorians, excluded from the Catholic Church, who brought the Gospel to China. "By their fruits shall ye know them" is still Christ's standard of judgment. And many, whose intellectual expression of faith was not Nicene Orthodoxy, have brought forth fruit in life, character and influence for which we ought to thank God.

All that I have said so far might be summed up in this criticism of almost all sections of the Christian Church in the past and of some in the present: that they have shown too great a reliance on intellectual definitions and on matters of organization and ritual, so that they have tended to elevate these into the tests of genuine Christianity. Is my criticism true? Ought, not these, but something else to be the test? And has the nature of that something else been rightly indicated? I would answer that the test which I suggest is in line with what is most distinctive in the religion of the Bible. Both in Old and New Testaments religion is trust in God issuing in life according to His will. The irreducible minimum of creed it stated in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* in the words: "He that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him", but that credal element is everywhere in Scripture entirely subordinated to the practical "trust and obey". Every Bible student knows that the message of the pre-exilic Prophets was obedience to God along the lines of righteousness and kindness, and that they spoke such strong words against sacrifice, which elsewhere was regarded as the essential element of religion, that many believe that they thought it had no place in genuine religion. Though much over-laid in the Law Books by ritual and sacrificial regulations, that message was never quite forgotten, and it is the theme of *Deuteronomy*. It was impressed on every Jew by

the weekly Synagogue Service which began with the congregational recitation of the *Shema* (*Deut.* 6[4ff.]) in which the sublime assertion, "The Lord your God is One Lord", the only credal element in Judaism, is at once followed by the command to love Him with heart and soul and strength, and to keep His commandments. The ideal of religion in the Old Testament is enshrined in the beautiful phrase "To walk with God".

It is not otherwise in the Gospels. Jesus says little or nothing about defined intellectual beliefs, nothing whatever about orders of ministry, He gives no instructions about forms and ceremonies, and it is actually a moot point amongst New Testament scholars whether He instituted the simple rites out of which the sacraments have grown. But what He did stress is clear everywhere. It was trust in God seeking His rule and His righteousness, caring for one's fellow man, and, in general, the prophetic message deepened and universalized.

What do we find today in all the Christian Churches? Surely this: that on those things, which the prophets and Jesus emphasized, there is general agreement. Our disputes and differences of opinion and practice are all concerned with things about which Jesus said either nothing or so little that it is scarcely possible to be quite sure what He meant, and almost certain that He was not much concerned about them.

Let me now submit three statements indicating what this something is upon which all who profess and call themselves Christians can agree. It is, I believe, essential Christianity, the Faith itself. The statements are not definitions. If definition means to state exactly the limits of the thing defined, it must be admitted that definition of the Faith is impossible. Nor can words really express it. Its expression requires the whole self in life. Words can at most indicate it.

Our United Christian Faith then is:

To commit our lives to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that He may work in us to will and to do of His good pleasure.

Put rather more fully and as much in the form of a statement of fact as in that of a duty laid upon us:

God, the Creator of all things, gives Himself to us in Jesus Christ. The one and only necessary response on our part to that gift is to accept it by giving ourselves to God. There results from this acceptance by self-giving a life guided and empowered by God.

A third pointer to the Faith is put almost in credal language, but like the others is intended not as an exact expression, but as an indicator, a reminder:

Through Jesus Christ and the Spirit of God within, I believe that God is love. I therefore commit my life to Him to be guided and

empowered by His Spirit, and led by Christ in all things to do His will.

One criticism may equally be passed on all of these pointers—that they set a standard of complete dedication to God, to which none of us would dare to say that he had attained. Perhaps that is their chief virtue, for thereby they remind us that this committal to God, the central essence of our Faith, must be continually renewed and deepened. If the criticism is passed on them that they fail to mention beliefs, which most of us regard as of great importance, for example the Deity of Christ and the Trinity, I would simply answer that the omission is deliberate. These doctrines are not the Faith. They are what many of us regard as its necessary intellectual implications. But the Faith is an act and attitude of the whole personality, not chiefly and not primarily a matter of intellectual definition. If the claim of anyone to be a Christian is supported by his life, no one has any right to deny him that name on the basis of inadequate intellectual expression. Let me repeat: unity has not been found on the basis of creeds, orders and sacraments, and I think I have shown good ground for supposing that it cannot be found in them. Nor will simplification of the creeds help much. Perhaps indeed some such statement as "I believe in God Almighty and that Jesus Christ revealed Him" might unite all Christians, but it has the fault of all the creeds hitherto produced, that it only makes an intellectual assertion. It is therefore not an indication of essential Christianity, for that must always point to a total attitude of the whole man.

We often hear it said today that any great new advance of Christianity must wait on the achievement of Christian unity. If this means unity of organization developed from the acceptance of the creeds, orders and sacraments, then it is certain that the advance will be long delayed. The truer statement rather is that such an advance will undoubtedly follow a widespread and deep-going grasp of the fact that Essential Christianity is what I have tried to indicate, and that with that advance will come the only unity that matters—unity in loyalty to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, unity in accepting His guidance and doing His will, constrained by His love and dependant on His power.

The fame of St. John of the Cross rests not only on his position as a Christian mystic, but also on his position as a poet. Professor E. Allison Peers, who has made available for English readers all the works of St. John of the Cross, has now published a separate edition of *The Poems of St. John of the Cross* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) which should appeal to those whose interests are in literature rather than in mysticism. The edition contains the Spanish text side by side with Prof. Peers' translation.

G. Duckworth.

GREEK VERSUS HEBREW

By Leonard T. Towers, M.A.

One of the features of modern life is the decline of the Classics in general esteem. "I never went to school to Aristotle or Plato", said John Bunyan, thereby implying that he never reached the classical Sixth, and further indicating that this was even in 1640 or thereabouts the recognized education of a gentleman. So it remained for well-nigh three hundred years; but today children are more interested in electrodes than the Electra, and in pilotless aircraft than pious Æneas; whilst an Oxford college reports that the numbers taking "Greats", the classical School in the University, number no more than those taking Geography.

Whether all this is regrettable or not may be a matter of opinion; but certain it is that if we want to understand the nature of our civilization, and with it something of the reason for our present discontents, we must be willing to do some exploration up the banks of the river down which we have come. It may be that somewhere up those banks we shall find that which we have lost, for lack of which much of our modern life appears so futile and meaningless.

Two main streams have formed the civilization of which we are a part, which we may call by a kind of courtesy title "Western Christendom" (without entering into the question as to how far we are entitled to call it Christian). The one stream flows from Greece and Rome, the other from Judæa. It is perhaps not without significance that whereas our schools have in the past spent a lot of time teaching Latin and Greek, the only people who have learned Hebrew have been students in theological colleges, and not always those! True, the Old Testament is taught in school as a Scripture lesson, but sometimes with a half-apologetic air, as if to say, "All this is frightfully primitive and you are not really expected to believe it".

Our debt to the Greeks is manifest to any who have tried to explore the river for any distance. From Greece has come to us the philosophical spirit, the desire for truth, the love of learning and scholarship that have made our schools and universities. From Greece has come the scientific spirit that by patient analysis discovers the essential principles of a subject, plots out its laws and reveals its processes. From Greece also has come the spirit of adventure that compels man's quest for truth, crossing frontiers, pushing into the unknown—all that is represented in man's search for the Ideal, his upward striving after goodness, truth and beauty, up to God Himself. This sense of striving aspiration, of the upreach

of desire, is expressed in the higher sense of the classical Greek word for "Love"—ἔρως—and its spirit is represented by Tennyson's "Ulysses":

> Come, my friends,
> 'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
> Push off, and sitting well in order smite
> The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
> To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
> Of all the western stars, until I die.

Our debt to the Hebrews is of another kind. When you open the Bible you find yourself at once in a different world from that of Plato and Aristotle. It is a different universe of discourse. Here is no philosophy (or what little there is might be described as "wise saws and modern instances") but immediately, on the very first page, a sense of the living God. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"—there you have it in the very first words—a living God Who does things, Who makes things, and Who is behind everything. How different is this sense of the name "God" from that which appears in Plato—where it is sometimes "God", sometimes "the gods", and sometimes "the Divine Reason", but is usually vague, nebulous and shadowy. Here in the Old Testament is a God Who is concrete, alive, frankly anthropomorphic, Who walks in the world He has created, Who interferes in its history, and Who manifests His power. Where Plato says, "the noblest of all studies is the study of what man should be and how he should live", the Hebrew thinker says, "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding". Aristotle taught his students that "it would be an odd sort of thing if a man were to say he loved Zeus", but the Hebrew youngster learned to repeat in the Shema "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy soul and with all thy strength". The Greek approach was intellectual, the Hebrew moral. When Athens sacked Histiœa and slaughtered all the males and sold the women and children as captives, Plato did not approve; he said that barbarians might treat one another so, but Greeks should not. But Amos brings such matters direct to Jahveh, and from Him speaks the living, blazing word of the Lord:

> Thus saith the Lord: for three transgressions of Gaza, yea for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they carried away captive the whole people, to deliver them up to Edom: but I will send a fire on the wall of Gaza, and it shall devour the palaces thereof. . . .
>
> Thus saith the Lord: for three transgressions of the children of Ammon, yea for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have ripped up the women with child of Gilead, that they might enlarge their border. . . .

> Thus saith the Lord: for three transgressions of Israel, yea for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have sold the righteous for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes. . . .[1]

In the Bible, even in the Old Testament, we are at once in the realm of Revelation. I do not mean in a world of magic or unreality, but that in the Scriptures we have something entirely different from anything that comes to us from Greek civilization and culture. Instead of man's striving after the ideal good, we have here God's striving with man. Instead of philosophical speculation about God, we have God's revelation of Himself—a progressive revelation indeed, as man is able to bear it, but revelation nevertheless. Instead of the mythology of gods and goddesses who come down to earth from time to time and behave in ways all too human, we have the word of the Lord given to the prophets, and finally the Incarnation of God Himself, the Word made flesh, the perfect human life that is also the perfect revelation of the Divine. For this, the early Christians had almost to invent a new word instead of the old pagan ἔρως, the reaching up from below. The new word was ἀγάπη, the reaching down from above, not the outreach of human desire but the overflowing of Divine love. The love of which St. Paul speaks in *1 Cor.* 13 is thus not just natural human affection, but our response to the Divine initiative of the love of God. As the author of *1 John* declares, "We love, because He first loved us".

To use Karl Barth's words:

> It is not the right human thoughts about God which form the real content of the Bible, but the right Divine thoughts about man. The Bible tells us not how we are to speak to God, but how God speaks to us; not how we are to find a way to God, but how he has sought and found a way to us.

The two streams, Greek and Hebrew, meet and mingle for the first time about 300 years before Christ. In the golden age of Greece, Hellas and Palestine had nothing to do with one another. Pericles and Ezra were contemporaries, but presumably were not acquaintances. It was after Alexander's conquest of Persia that the gradual process of infiltration of Greek ideas into Palestine began, and it was a conquest more thorough and effective than any of the previous military conquests by the armed might of Assyria or Babylon. The result was that despite the revolt of the Maccabæan period, by the time of our Lord Greek was the language of commerce and culture in the whole Mediterranean world. But the Hellenistic age contained within itself the seeds of its own decay. The Christian Gospel brought new life to a dying pagan civilization. The process of assimilating the Gospel to the thought-forms of the day began at

[1] I owe this comparison to Mr. S. H. Moore, *Silcoate's Sunday Evenings*, chap. xii.

once, largely owing to the amazing expansion of Christianity in the first century, and the result of such reflection and assimilation is clearly to be seen in certain parts of the New Testament, particularly in the Fourth Gospel. From this time forth the two branches become one and are never entirely separated. But there appear from time to time on each side what one might call waterfalls from the original springs which pour fresh reinforcement into the main stream.

A great inflowing of the Greek spirit is to be seen, after the breakdown of the medieval synthesis that attempted to make a unity of the old world-order, in the Renaissance—the rebirth of art and learning, and the beginnings of modern science, which at last is able to shake off the shackles that the medieval system imposed upon it. The line here may be said to run roughly from Erasmus through Locke and Rousseau to Kant and Hegel on the one hand, and from Roger Bacon through Copernicus and Galileo to Newton and Darwin on the other.

The reappearance of the Hebraic stream is to be seen at various points, as for example at the Reformation, the Puritan movement, and the Evangelical Revival—where the line starts with Luther and Calvin and runs through Baxter and Bunyan to Wesley and Whitefield—and, one may add, from them through missionary spirits such as Morrison and Livingstone, and practical social reformers such as Shaftesbury and Wilberforce. Here there is in each case a recall to the purity and simplicity of the Gospel; an emphasis not upon what man can do for himself, but upon what God has done for him; a call to self-discipline and practical Christian service in daily life[2].

The conflict between these two strains is portrayed in a novel by Merejkowski entitled *The Forerunner,* based on the note-books of Leonardo da Vinci. Within this strange genius there are two faiths struggling to be born; on the one hand the Hellenic faith in Man as free, directing his own actions, ever seeking to raise himself towards divinity; and on the other hand the Jewish-Christian faith in God as redemptive, self-revealing, stooping to assume our humanity. Dostoievsky has described this as "the struggle between two mighty opposites, the God-man and the Man-God, between Christ and the Belvedere Apollo". But they are not always in conflict. The coming together of Greek and Hebrew means that each has become to a certain extent assimilated with the other. Nevertheless they are distinguishable and indeed may be distinct from one another in individual instances. Thus a philosopher or a scientist may also be a sincere and humble Christian—or he may not. He may, like Newton, feel himself to be as a little child

[2] I am far from saying that these are the only points at which the re-emergence of this spirit is to be observed; but I mention these as being examples of it.

gathering pebbles on the shores of eternity, or he may have no religious belief at all. The scientific spirit may be a deeply religious spirit, or it may be a spirit of agnosticism, if only because of its tendency not to take anything on trust. On the other hand, in religion it is sometimes the Hebrew, sometimes the Greek element that prevails. Christian thought may follow the lines of traditional theology, or it may seek to interpret religion as a search for truth, casting off traditional dogmas as outworn. A minister who had invited Dr. Joad to speak to his congregation on a Sunday evening is reported to have introduced him by saying that his presence "provided evidence that *some* churches were seeking to interpret Christianity in terms of modern thought". But might it not be said that the true function of the Church is precisely the opposite one of interpreting modern thought in terms of Christian truth? Does "modern thought" indeed provide the ultimate authority by which our religion stands or falls? And is that authority to be Dr. Joad, H. G. Wells, or Bertrand Russell? Who of them provides the modern thought in terms of which religion has to be stated?

The truth is that for a very long time the Greek element in our cultural inheritance has been far outstripping the Hebrew. This is not just another way of saying that man's moral and spiritual advance has not kept pace with his scientific advance; the situation is more serious than that. For the past 300 years man has been engaged in trying to master his environment, and he has succeeded in tapping the enormous forces of the universe and moulding them to his will; but his real problem is within himself. We have wrested the secrets of nature and fitted them to our use. But something has gone wrong. Every new invention, instead of being hailed with joy as a triumph of human discovery and ingenuity, fills us with fear and horror as we think of the uses to which it may be put. Whilst scientific and technical achievements have been advancing beyond all recognition, religious belief and moral standards have been steadily declining, until it is a commonplace to say that the majority of the people of this country have no connection with any form of organized religion. Two world wars have dealt shattering blows to the cheerful optimism of our forefathers. The golden dreams of poets and pioneers for the future of the human race have turned, as if by the touch of some evil fairy, into nightmares; whilst the modern thought in terms of which we are invited to interpret Christianity is, for the most part, spiritually bankrupt. Mr. H. G. Wells says, in *Mind at the End of its Tether*:

> Our world is like a convoy lost in darkness on an unknown rocky coast, with quarrelling pirates in the chart room and savages clambering up the sides of the ships to plunder and do evil as the whim may take them. Mind, near exhaustion, still

makes its final futile movement towards that way out or round or through the impasse. That is the utmost now that mind can do. And this, its last expiring thrust, is to demonstrate that the door closes upon us for evermore. There is no way out or round or through. It is the end.

But man's extremity is God's opportunity. It is when the city is beleaguered and the prophet shut in that the mountains appear full of horses and chariots of fire. It is when the world is full of sin and death, of fear and foreboding, that God sends forth His Son. Already there are signs of a religious reawakening. It comes first from the thinkers, the theologians both popular and unpopular. It is coming in the recovery of the meaning of the great words of our faith—Revelation, Incarnation, Resurrection, Redemption. It is seen in the work of people like Emil Brunner on the Continent, Reinhold Niebuhr in America, and C. S. Lewis in this country. As a renewed sense of the living God coming from outside ourselves and our universe into our human predicament lays hold upon us, as it penetrates from the thinker to the preacher, from the pulpit to the pew, and from the pew to the people outside, it will stir and thrill men's hearts as nothing else has done for a generation.

I hope that in thus setting forth the rival claims of "Greek versus Hebrew" I have not implied that we can dispense with either. We need them both. Both have contributed richly to our inheritance. There is no necessary antagonism between the sons of Zion and the sons of Greece; they are complementary rather than antagonistic. But I do suggest that for a very long time both in our education and our common life the scientific temper has been increasingly stressed at the expense of the classical, so that today we are in danger of producing a race of skilled technicians who are incapable of apprehending abstract ideas, let alone religious beliefs[3]; whilst even amongst the few who are interested in the "humanities" the emphasis has been overwhelmingly on the side of the Greek rather than the Hebrew, so that we have produced a philosophical Humanism without any living roots in religious faith. It is high time that we did something to redress the balance—not by compelling the unwilling scientists to learn Greek, nor the Greek scholars to learn Hebrew, but by recovering the legacy that Israel has bequeathed to us—a sense of the living God Who can do things with and in His world, Who reveals Himself in both creation and redemption, Who is both holy and personal, and with Whom we all have to do. Here is the task of the Church: to reveal the living God to the men and women of this generation.

Plato gave us the ideal of life in the Good, the True and the Beautiful; Aristotle set up before us his ideal man, the μεγαλόψυχος

[3] See *Towards the Conversion of England*, the Report of a Commission on Evangelism appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, p. 13.

and bade us take him as a pattern. But it is from Judæa that we hear a voice saying to us, "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse; therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed; to love the Lord thy God, to obey his voice, and to cleave unto him . . . " It is through a Hebrew prophet that the call comes to us, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else". And it is the Saviour of both the Jew and the Greek who declares to us from the Cross that stands over against the world, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself".

Sir Arthur Salter, in the course of a varied career, has had personal contacts with many of the leading statesmen of recent years — British, French, American and Chinese. In *Personality in Politics* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) he draws upon his observations and experience to illustrate the influence of the characters of men in power upon the course of world affairs. It is a book which is at once profoundly interesting and disturbing. Sir Arthur remains admirably objective even when, as in the case of Mr. Churchill, he finds it hard to keep what he thinks and feels "this side idolatry".

From Failure to Fulfilment, by the Rev. John Martin (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), is a book on pastoral psychology which contains much that will be useful to the ordinary minister in his practical work. As the Rev. L. D. Weatherhead points out in a foreword, a psychological method hostile (or, we should say, indifferent) to true religion fails the patient at a vital point. It may achieve analysis, but the patient then needs synthesis. Mr. Martin is concerned with the building up of a balanced personality after the roots of a trouble have been discovered. We have one misgiving about the book. The inexperienced may suppose, from the many cases quoted in illustration, that it is nearly always easy to unearth some definite incident which is the cause of the trouble. The job is not quite so simple as Mr. Martin sometimes makes it appear! The bibliography is not altogether satisfying. There is, for example, no mention of Dr. Karen Horney, whose work is of immense value to the pastoral psychologist. There are some spelling mistakes which will need attention when a new edition is issued.

A book which Church officials may well keep handy for reference is *Some Legal Aspects of Charities* (Fiscal Press, 7s. 6d.), which has been issued by the Technical Research Committee of the Association of Certified and Corporate Accountants. It gives information and guidance on such questions as the exemption from income-tax of income from charitable bodies, covenanted subscriptions, etc.

Most ministers are asked from time to time to advise young people anxious to begin a career in some form of social service. They will find *Salaries and Conditions of Work of Social Workers* (National Council of Social Service, 2s. 6d.) a mine of information on the opportunities available, training required, salary scales, etc.

L. J. Tizard.

ISAAC WATTS: A NEW JUDGMENT

By Harry Escott, M.A.

I

It is widely known that the classic hymn, "When I survey the wondrous cross", had for its second line, in the original text, *"Where the young Prince of glory died"*. But it is not equally realized that the line as originally written reflects the youthful ardour of its author. It comes as a shock to our preconceived ideas to realize that this great hymn, along with many others great and not so great, was penned, not by the venerable man with venerable wig, who figures opposite so many a title page of *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, but by a youthful 'immature' Christian. Isaac Watts began his career as a hymn writer when he was about twenty-one years of age. We are told that a considerable number of his hymns were written before he had preached his first sermon, which was on his twenty-fourth birthday. However that may be, it is certain that his *Horae Lyricae* and his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* were ready for publication as early as 1705, when he had attained his thirty-first year. It is, then, for the most part, the revolutionary work of a young Christian that we recall and celebrate in this bicentenary year of Watts's death.

But in our estimation of the contribution this young genius has made to the praise of all the churches, we would be wisely guided by Gladstone's saying, that the orator 'receives from his audience in a vapour what he returns in a flood', remembering that such an *obiter dictum* is as applicable to religious leadership as to political. Most of the books and essays we have read about Watts and his work in the field of Christian worship give the erroneous and misleading impression that, as far as the reformation of worship was concerned, he was a solitary star in a very black sky. An historical approach to the period in which he lived and laboured reveals, however, a whole constellation, albeit a dim and fluctuating one, which nevertheless shone with some guiding light on the subject and practice of Church praise. Watts was not by any means the only one who desired to change the tone of public worship in the meeting houses of early 18th-century London. His system of worship-song and prayer, formed mostly in his youth, and characterized by the rebelliousness and intrepidity of youth, was to the more conservative in the Nonconformist churches like a destructive *flood*, sweeping away

many of the old landmarks. But this flood had drawn much of its force from those *vapours* of dissatisfaction with the disorderly worship of the churches, which appeared, if no bigger and more menacing than a man's hand, in the last quarter of the 17th century.

Among the Baptists, Benjamin Keach (1646-1704) and Joseph Stennett had done something to renovate the form and spirit of public praise which went beyond their own communion. In the Presbyterian fold there had been the cautious but germinative contribution of Richard Baxter (1615-1691), who as early as 1661, in his *Reformed Liturgy,* voiced the opinion of a progressive section of his Church on the question of the legitimate character of Christian worship. William Barton, Matthew Henry, Joseph Boyse, and Samuel Bury have no small place in the gentle movement to reform the psalmody and evangelize the hymnody of the Free Churches in the last twenty-five years of the 17th century. Among the Independents (and it is never easy to draw a hard and fast line between them and the Presbyterians of this period) there had been the hymnological work of Richard Davis, of Rothwell, and the *Penitential Cries of Thomas Shepherd,* and a historic experiment at the Kings Weigh House, Eastcheap, to improve the performance and matter of the Church's song by inaugurating a weekly lecture—an experiment which a little later linked up with the more radical revolution in Church praise associated with the name of Isaac Watts.

Watts, then, for all his genius, intellectual resources, and youthful ardour and daring, did not work *in vacuo*. He received from his age in *vapour* what he returned in *flood*. Anyone with the patience and interest may see, by a careful comparison of the *Psalms and Hymns* with the work of Denham, Patrick, Mason, Stennett, Barton, and others in this field, the derivative features of Watts's work in hymnology. The fact is, outside the *Horae Lyricae*—which contains minor 17th-century poetry of fairly high order, and some metrical experiments unusual at the time—Watts appears more as a painstaking popularizer and systematizer than a creative artist. (We do not forget, of course, the 'meridian light and fervour' which occasionally breaks through even in the Hymns and Psalms, and those unforgettable surprises which sometimes glow among the dross of uninspired and badly-worded lines, shining there like rare jewels.) But the real genius of Watts is, we think, in the *Augustan* and not the *Romantic* mould—he had the rare gift of popularizing the abstruse and pigeon-holing the relevant. And it was this gift which made him a pioneer in many branches of education. His *Improvement of the Mind,* his *Logic,* his *Guide to Prayer,* his *Catechisms,* his *Divine and Moral Songs for Children,* and even the *Hymns and Psalms* themselves are largely the expressions of Watts's

Augustan passion (to use a paradox) for simplicity, clarity and system.

There are, as we have said, many derivative factors in Watts's work, but this genius for systematization in praise and prayer is his unique and original contribution to the Church's worship. Before he set his hands to this revolutionary task there had been attempts, even as far back as Elizabethan times, to evangelize the Psalter, and nearer his own day in the work of Luke Milbourne and John Patrick. But this work had been piecemeal and half-hearted. And it had been the same in the sphere of New Testament song. Davis, Stennett, Barton and Boyse had been before him. And again, there had been nothing thorough in these hymnological reforms. The young Watts, rebel as he was, could not be satisfied with anything less than a root and branch change in the spirit and content of the Church's praise. It is this genius for *system*—this architectonic character of Watts's work—that claims our attention now. He began to build the framework of his system of Praise and Prayer (and indeed each item in it) with a definite architectural plan in his mind. No longer would it be possible for him to use New Testament Hymns as a mere *supplement* to the Psalms of David. Underlying both Psalms and Hymns was a definite purpose—a clearly defined philosophy of worship; and both were to be components in a planned and fully-rounded system of evangelical hymnody. From Watts's *Prefaces*—which deserve far more attention than they receive, and compare most favourably with the more applauded prefatory words of John Wesley—we are able to discern quite clearly the three principles which guided him as he framed his system of Church song:

(1) It should be *Evangelical,* and not just sporadically so; the whole body of communal praise, Psalms and Hymns alike, should be brought within the light and temper of the Gospel.

(2) It should be *freely-composed,* not paraphrastic, but leaving room for the guidance of the Spirit.

(3) *It should express the thoughts and feelings of those who sing.*

II

Now Watts's work for a fully-rounded system of worship did not stop with the communal praise of the Church, it extended also to its *prayers*. In 1715 he delivered to the young folk of his own Church a series of talks on prayer, which in the same year were published in book form with the title *A Guide to Prayer or a free and rational account of the Gift, Grace and Spirit of Prayer, with plain directions how every Christian may attain them.* It is not another book of prayers which he offers, nor a rationale of prayer, nor even a book

of personal devotion. It is rather a *map* of prayer for the guidance of the Church. The little book is, we believe, an attempt on a slighter scale to do for social prayer what he had already planned to do and in part achieved for public praise, and so realize (if only in his own Church) a systematic diet of worship. The *Guide to Prayer* owes not a little in conception and design to another great systematizer, to whom Watts expresses his indebtedness in the preface—John Wilkins (1614-1672), Bishop of Chester, one of the founders of the Royal Society, author of *An Essay towards a real Character and Philosophical Language,* and a writer whom Edmund Gosse regards as the first man in England to use the simplified 'scientific' prose style. There is ample evidence that Watts owed more to Wilkins than some of the thoughts and much of the form of the *Guide.* He emulated, it would appear, the spiritual disposition of this sweet-tempered and tolerant Anglican who had looked so kindly upon the harassed nonconformists. Like Wilkins, Watts was a Christian humanist, sharing the same scientific pursuits, and perhaps copying the Bishop's simple and lucid style.

But though there are derivative features in Watts's *Guide to Prayer,* it is very much a tract for the times. It reflects over and over again the unintelligent, disorderly and neglectful character of the public prayers of some nonconformist Churches of the day. He writes:

> I do not think that prayer in public assemblies should be so short, as though the only design of it were a mere preface before the sermon, or a benediction after it. Whereas social prayer is one considerable part, if not the chief duty of public worship; and we ought generally to continue so long in it, as to run through the most necessary and important purposes of a social address to the Throne of Grace. Christian prudence will teach us to determine the length of our prayers agreeably to the occasion and present circumstances, and according to the measure of our own ability for this work[1].

In a number of directions how to attain the gift of prayer he says:

> Do not affect to pray long, for the sake of length, or to stretch out your matter by labour and toil of thought, beyond the furniture of your own spirit[2].

He has much to say also against the prayer that is actually another sermon. He suggests that the Church needs to take a middle course between set forms, which tend to imprison the Spirit, and unpremeditated outpourings of minds unprepared by meditation on Scripture. He supplies a Scheme of Christian prayer which brings order into this part of worship while leaving freedom in the Spirit—part of the genius of the communion to which he belongs. The *Guide*

1 p. 60. 2 p. 58.

to Prayer, along with the *Psalms and Hymns,* was Watts's attempt to give to the Free Churches a system of worship, at once orderly and free, that should make up for the lack of a set Liturgy. And the same three principles, enunciated above with reference to his system of praise, seem to have guided him in this parallel system of prayer:

(1) The Prayers of the Church should be framed *in the light of the Bible revelation* of the nature and purpose of God.

(2) They should be *freely composed*—systematic—but leaving room for the guidance of the Spirit.

(3) *They should express the thoughts and feelings of those who pray.*

A revived interest in this worship-reform of Isaac Watts, at the approaching bicentenary of his death, 25th November, 1948, is evinced by the promised inclusion of more of his hymns in the new hymn book of Congregationalism, and by the recent reprint of his *Guide to Prayer* by our Methodist friends.

Mr. W. H. Parry's *Thirteen Centuries of English Music* (Hinrichsen, 4s. 6d.) should be on the bookshelf of every organist and every minister. It surveys the growth of English Church music with adroit economy, sure judgment, astonishing brevity, and skilful selectivity. Not the least interesting part of the book is the penultimate chapter, which includes specimen pages of church music of the various periods with brief commentaries. There is a case for the view that the sanity of music is being preserved more safely in English Church Music than anywhere else at present, and this admirable little book reinforces that case. One hopes that it will have a very wide circulation.

English Hymns and Hymn-writers, by Canon Adam Fox (Collins, 5s.), is No. 98 in the "Britain in Pictures" series, and is as tastefully produced and pleasantly written as we expect of this charming series. It is the greater misfortune, therefore, that the reader must be warned against taking the book seriously as a factual authority. The general statements about the Scottish Psalters on pp. 14-16 are inaccurate and the statement that Sternhold and Hopkins borrowed from the Genevan Psalter of 1561 is untrue. This and similar errors are a great pity; had they been absent this would have been a very delightful book.

ERIK ROUTLEY.

In *They Came to a Stable* (Independent Press, 2s.) Mr. Stanley Brown presents a simple rendering of the Nativity story which should please many amateur players. The treatment is not very original, and the central character—a little girl—suffers from a frequent defect in Nativity plays in being "fey", a quality demanding an unusual range from a child actor. The sincerity of the writing, however, somewhat compensates for these drawbacks, and for that the play is to be commended.

KATHLEEN NESBITT.

PASTOR AND PEOPLE

[Articles in this series deal with pastoral problems, which confront ministers in the course of their ordinary work. We invite readers to suggest subjects.]

METHOD IN INTERVIEWING

Non-Directive Psychotherapy

By F. Ross Brown

In this matter of interviewing people, it is usually the practical considerations that are uppermost in our minds. "Here am I", you say, "a minister with a busy church and many claims on my time. People come to me with their problems, and I feel it is not primarily religious instruction they want, but an opportunity to be set free from tensions within, personality maladjustments which prevent them from being and doing their best. Now just what can I do about it, and how can I give the most effective help? Does this art of interviewing depend entirely on the flair I may have for this sort of thing, my skill in being able to make a shrewd guess at the heart of the problem, my ability to give them good counsel, or is there any definite method, any special technique that might be used to aid treatment?"

In one sense of course interviewing is an art, that is, it will depend on the degree of your real understanding of people and your skill, acquired through practice, in handling the interview, but we are now able to speak more confidently of method, since this mystery of interviewing, which for obvious reasons takes place behind closed doors, is now open for review. It is possible to observe the process, analyse in detail what has been said in a series of interviews by patient and therapist, and see what techniques are likely to aid or hinder treatment.

This has been made possible by a great deal of research that has been carried on in the U.S.A.[1] A microphone has been introduced into the interviewing room which has recorded the process of treatment both in successful and unsuccessful cases. Thus a verbatim account of all that has been said, and the way it has been said by patient and therapist has been available for study afterwards. Where

1 This research is now being carried on at the University of Chicago under the direction of Dr. Carl R. Rogers, who first formulated the principles and techniques of the treatment-interview, known in the U.S.A. as Non-Directive Psychotherapy. This method, which is described in this article and in which the writer received training, is being used by an increasing number of ministers, social workers, and clinical psychologists in the U.S.A.

recording apparatus has not been available, detailed notes have been taken by the therapist in the course of interviewing.

The method of treatment which has produced this material for research is based on two principles which seem justified in our approach to the individual coming to us for help. The first is the belief that people can solve their own problems and make their own adjustments better than we can do these things for them. They may try to pass the responsibility to us, but if we are wise we shall not accept it, because no decision we can make for others can be as helpful to them as the one they arrive at themselves. There is this to be said, of course, that no patient would ever come to a minister or anyone else if he felt he was able to worry through his problems on his own, and it is that lack of self-confidence in coping with a situation which makes him prepared to accept a dependent rôle in the interview. Some patients indeed with submerged feelings of hostility, ready to be worked off in any convenient direction, may ask advice of you merely to prove you are wrong, and will tell you so in no uncertain manner. But apart from traps like these, even in the case of a patient genuinely in need of advice, we shall try to build up a sense of responsibility about his own decisions and use techniques that will help him to help himself. Incidentally, this principle helps to define the class of patient most likely to find help in the interviewing situation. Obviously it means those who are prepared to do something about their problems, for we cannot help those who do not feel the need of help. Usually a minister who is at all sensitive to the needs of people can provide opportunities for them to talk over their problems, and in the case of patients asking for an interview, you can assume at least the initial desire is there for better adjustment. Where people are not capable of governing their own lives, or are in a state of mental disorder where they can no longer help themselves, it is fairly obvious they need treatment other than the interviewing method. To give effective treatment you must assume that those who come for help have this potential capacity for responsible decisions.

The second principle is the belief that people have an enormous capacity within themselves for adjustment, a drive in the direction of maturity. We see this readily in the physical life. The baby through various stages of development grows into the mature adult. The infant dependent on people and surroundings grows towards the independence of adult life. The same principle is at work in mental and spiritual development. The personality, the whole self, is capable of change in the direction of maturity and adjustment to conditions of living. The reason some people remain immature in themselves or in behaviour is not because they lack the power to grow, but because the maladjustments and tensions within have

twisted and warped their true development. If they can only be set free from the negative emotion which clouds over and confuses the problems they bring to us, if they can only gain insight into their real motives and attitudes, then the way is clear for a more satisfactory adjustment to life. It is this urge to maturity within the individual which we shall respect in the interview and upon which we shall rely, believing that the techniques which will aid treatment will be those that will release these forces of growth, stunted by conflict within, and circumstances without.

These principles, if accepted, will have very definite bearing on the method we shall use in interviewing people who come for help. For one thing, it will make a difference to the way you talk to them. If you are going to foster independence on the part of a patient for his own decisions, you will be extremely hesitant about offering advice, or putting leading questions which will convey to him the impression that you are taking responsibility for his problems. You will be even more careful about giving an interpretation of psychological attitudes even if you feel competent to do so. Giving a psychological diagnosis is always a heavy responsibility for the therapist, and sometimes may do positive harm[2]. But you will avoid such techniques primarily because you believe the best insight is the one the patient arrives at himself, in his own time and in his own way. It is not easy to exercise such restraint as this, because when people come to you, usually you can see their problem objectively, free from the emotion that clouds their insight, and you naturally want to tell them what is wrong or what they should do. But as accurately as you are able to diagnose, it is of little help to the patient unless he has reached that point of insight himself.

Time and again in case records where the therapist has gone further in his interpretation than the patient is prepared to accept, the patient often becomes defensive and says, "Oh, I didn't mean that at all", or there is an emotional blockage when he replies, "I've forgotten; what was I saying?" or the conversation dries up in a long pause. The shrewder the interpretation, the surer it makes its target, the greater is the defensiveness it arouses, unless the patient himself has reached that point of insight.

If the aim is to help the patient to help himself, to release growth forces within, to set him free from the feeling that he has to be defensive in any way about the matter he brings to you, it will mean techniques other than putting questions, giving advice, or interpreting the problem in psychological terms.

You may feel it leaves very little to do except to sit still and listen. If you like to call this a technique, it is one of the most effective that

[2] There are cases when both incompetent and competent psychological interpretation has precipitated a psychosis in a patient.

can be used[3]. It means on your part being willing to listen and accept in an understanding manner, without comment, anything that a patient may care to tell you. You must be able to convey to him by your manner and general attitude the impression, "This man is listening with interest to what I am saying and trying to see things as they appear to me". The more you are able to look at things from his point of view, the less will you be concerned with your own reactions to what is being said. It means on your part such obvious things as being relaxed, interested, shock-proof, but more than anything else, a good listener. A good listener is an active listener, for talking less carries with it the obligation of thinking more, and such simple replies on your part as "Yes", "I see", "I understand" in the right atmosphere of acceptance helps the patient to feel free to talk out his problems.

Once he is able to do this, treatment has commenced. For one thing, in talking them out he feels he is doing something about his troubles, the urge to solution is focused on them; for another, he is finding emotional release[4]. To realize the value of this is to avoid the common mistake of supposing that the only constructive purpose in interviewing is the solution of the patient's problem. "Here", you say, "is this man telling me his story; now what can he do about it? What advice can I give him?" We are less concerned about final solutions the more we appreciate the fact that he is receiving definite help by being able to talk freely to an understanding listener. If you can provide the right kind of atmosphere where the patient knows that the material he brings arouses no feeling of guilt or shame or makes him look foolish, and is so easily accepted by you, his emotional tension is reduced, he feels more relaxed, and he gains a clearer vision of the real factors involved, because this acceptance on your part makes argument or defence unnecessary. This presupposes that in the right atmosphere every patient is ready to pour out his troubles into a sympathetic ear, but in practice it does not often work out like that. There is the patient who is tongue-tied and does not find it easy to talk to you however understanding you might be, who sits there in awkward silences waiting for you to do or say something. These pauses are often embarrassing in the early stages of an interview[5].

[3] Leslie J. Tizard in his article on "The art of interviewing" in July, 1947, issue stresses rightly "Nine-tenths of the art of personal dealing lies in listening".

[4] The psychological value of emotional release is recognized in methods of treatment other than this. It is as old as the Roman Catholic Confessional and as new as catharsis in modern psychology. 'Confession is good for the soul' and for the body too. Patients often say after such emotional release they are able to sleep better, or their skin irritations have cleared up (cf. psycho-somatic field).

[5] Pauses frequently occur at later stages in a series of interviews with a patient, where he has arrived at some point of deep insight, or is making a positive decision, and should not be broken unless absolutely necessary. If you are taking notes, pauses can often be bridged by writing.

One way out is to invite him to explore the matter further with a question similar to this, "Would you care to tell me a little more about that?" This is not the type of question that passes any responsibility to you, since whether he wishes to continue or not is still his own decision.

Another way is to suggest an occupation that might fill in a pause and ease tension by saying something on these lines: "Perhaps you feel there is nothing more you would care to talk about just now. Well, let's sit back and enjoy a smoke".

Most frequently a verbal description of what this type of interviewing is will help a patient to talk, especially as it reminds him that the use he makes of the interview, and the benefit he gains from it, is entirely up to him. The following is an excerpt from an actual case record where the patient, a delinquent girl aged 16, wishes to pass the responsibility for the interview to the therapist, who finds it necessary to give a verbal description.

P[6]. (long pause). I guess I haven't anything particular to say—all I could do is to answer questions.
T. You'd rather I would ask questions, so you would know more what to say?
P. Yes—what do you want to know?
T. Well, Jane—I only want to know what you would care to tell me. You see this time is to be yours to talk over anything which *you* are concerned about—any problem that may be bothering you. It may be that there isn't anything you want to discuss. That's O.K. It's just that you may if you want to.
P. Hmmm—shall I tell you about . . . ? (and she goes ahead talking of her problems without further difficulty).

There is also the patient who tells you why he has come to see you and then says: "Now that's my problem. What do you advise me to do about it?" If you answer this or similar questions directly he will assume you are willing to take responsibility for decisions that should be his.

The following is an excerpt from the same case, where the therapist avoids answering a question, and making a decision the girl should make.

P. I want to ask you a question. Do you think it is wrong for me to be getting letters from my boy friend?
T. You'd like me to decide that for you?
P. Yes. I don't think I have had enough opportunity to know what is right.
T. You are afraid that you aren't able to decide for yourself what is right.
P. No. Well, why won't you tell me?

[6] P—patient; T—therapist.

T. If I told you what I think—it still wouldn't be what you think, perhaps, and then it really wouldn't be satisfactory for you. I think one has to decide a thing like that for herself, according to her own thinking.

P. Well, since I'm here I think it is all right to have a boy friend but that I shouldn't get too serious with him. . . .

Pauses can be bridged, patients can usually be encouraged to talk, leading questions can be avoided by skill and initiative in handling these situations as they arise.

Another technique which is important in aiding treatment is the skill with which you are able to look behind the content of what is being said to you to the underlying feelings that are being expressed. Patients often want to inveigle you into an intellectual discussion, sometimes, since you are a minister, a religious topic, or if they know a little psychology they will allow the conversation to meander down psychological bypaths. Although they may not realize it, this is an evasion of the issue, a safe topic. We can be certain of this, the problems that people bring to us are hardly ever intellectual, they are emotional, and for that reason we can neither convince nor help by reasoning. You need to sense the feelings and attitudes which are being expressed through the words that are being said. A patient when his marriage is in difficulty may express hostility towards his wife. We are tempted to pour oil on troubled waters and say, "Now really, old chap, I am sure your wife isn't as bad as you think she is". That is a denial of his feeling about her. It does not follow that his feeling is necessarily right, but that is how it seems to him at the moment. To deny that feeling is either to make him feel guilty and defensive about it, or to give him the impression you do not understand. Either way, it raises a barrier against the acceptance and understanding necessary for treatment. The better course would be to accept his feelings of hostility, whether you think he is right or not, and reflect them back to him by saying, "You feel badly about that". This reflection of feeling is almost like holding a mirror up to the patient and letting him see exactly how he feels about things. The only way it can be done accurately is to let go your own judgment or diagnosis of a case and concentrate on this: "Now what feeling is he expressing while he is saying this to me?" and reflect it back to him in your own words. The following excerpt which illustrates this technique in practice is taken from the third interview with a university student. It is interesting not only for the reflection of attitudes by the therapist, but also for the degree of insight the student is gaining in regard to his real problem which is accompanied by growing responsibility on his part.

T. (summing up significant attitudes which have previously been expressed by patient). You're concerned about your

inability to make decisions, and the fact that it is hard for you to be yourself, and you wonder how sincere you really are. (Long, long pause.)

P. As I see it, I have to decide on the limitations of my own capacity. I have to size up my ability, and if you have no discipline—and I haven't—my family gave me no discipline —they were weak rather than intelligent. My mother didn't remarry after my father's death because she wanted to be free to raise the family. She wasn't of benefit in giving discipline or any sense of responsibility. The question is how to acquire it. But that pattern has gone on for a long time and the changes that would be necessary are repugnant to me—and can I make them? I do have some goals, and if I learn to discipline myself I can reach them, but can I?

T. You feel you are facing a pretty deep question that doesn't have an easy answer. You wonder if you could make it[7].

P. I know a friend who overcame some of these things. I think I should be able to learn self-discipline but—

T. You feel you should, but you wonder.

P. (with strong feeling). Gosh, we say that this thing and that thing is a challenge — this problem of meeting your own problems is the biggest challenge of all! But hell is paved with good intentions.

T. You feel it is a challenge but that doesn't guarantee that you can meet it.

P. I need to know how to go about it. I can see some of the details, like facing situations immediately, and meeting them head on, not dodging and evading things.

T. You feel you see a few of the things you could do.

P. I've probably been a little more conscious of these things since talking with you. . . .

The psychological value of reflection of feeling and attitude is that the patient in hearing calm statements by the therapist of the feelings he is expressing is able to grasp their meaning. To know that he feels these emotions is a step to adjustment because he gains new knowledge of what he is. He sees with growing clearness what his likes and dislikes are and what he really wants. The more accurate the reflection of feeling, the deeper are the attitudes he is able to explore. He discovers fundamental problems out of which all the others emerge, and this gives him a clearer and more unified view of his life pattern. The spontaneous outcome of such deep insight is that he is now able to make satisfying choices and responsible decisions in keeping with this new view of himself.

In case records where these techniques have been used, acceptance to aid emotional release and reflection of feeling to reveal basic

[7] Sometimes it is necessary to reflect ambivalent feeling. Perhaps a better response at that point would have been: "You would like to reach those goals, and yet you wonder if you could".

attitudes, the outcome has been predictable. The patient has usually been able to accept himself and make a more satisfactory adjustment to life[8]. He is not necessarily totally adjusted and mature, often far from it, but forces have been released within him which should develop into satisfying life patterns[9].

This method is not concerned primarily with the solving of particular problems, but with sending the patient out from treatment better adjusted in himself to meet this or any other problem that may arise in the future. The focus is on the individual, not his problem.

There are one or two other practical considerations which arise in this method of interviewing.

It has been found advisable to fix a time limit for the interview (usually one hour) and not to go beyond it. This has been found to give a patient a sense of security. It is his time, fixed and definite, and he may use it as he wishes.

The decision about coming for another interview is always left to the patient. This is in keeping with the principle that the responsibility shall be his, not yours.

There is usually little difficulty in ending a series of interviews, because if treatment has been along the lines suggested and independence has been fostered, the patient comes to a point where he feels that a further interview can be of little help to him. Transference, the emotional attachment to the therapist, hardly ever occurs if interviewing is handled in this manner, because he is never allowed to feel dependent on you.

Detailed note-taking which is important in giving you an idea, after the interview, how you have handled the situation or what attitudes have been expressed, is sometimes thought to be embarrassing to a patient. It rarely is if it is explained to him that he may see these notes at any time, but if it hinders treatment in any way, note-taking should be dropped. Perhaps this excerpt will help to show the frequent reaction of patients:

P. (pointing to the notes). What are you going to do with those? What did you write down?

T. I was wondering if you would want to see them. You see they are notes on what we have been saying this morning. Here is this part where we talked about . . . and here is . . . I usually take notes as reminders so that before we talk again, I can read them and remind myself of what we said this time.

P. Oh, that's a good idea.

You may feel there is nothing specifically religious in this method

[8] Otto Rank, the psychologist, says: "the neurotic type which we all represent to a certain extent, suffers from the fact he cannot accept himself, cannot endure himself, and will not have it otherwise" (*Will Therapy*, p. 241). To help a patient to accept himself is for him to want it otherwise.

[9] In the follow-up of cases patients have continued to make satisfactory adjustment, and have rarely returned for further treatment.

of interviewing. People who come to us with personality problems hardly ever want religious instruction, nor would benefit from it as much as they might until they are better adjusted. In the interview we try to provide the right kind of atmosphere and adopt methods which will enable people to talk freely about their problems and gain insight into themselves. Silent prayer or a prayer of confession may be very helpful at the end of an interview, especially where you sense the need. Patients can be lent books on religious faith for reading in between interviews, and certainly when treatment has ceased, the better adjusted person should be linked up to church fellowship and activities, and when necessary given religious instruction. But to mix religious teaching with treatment methods in the interview itself is to do neither well.

There is reason to suppose that such insight, acceptance of self and growth towards maturity is a spiritual experience in itself. Patients helped in this way often express this feeling. The following is an example taken from the close of a series of four interviews with a patient. It is an unsolicited tribute to this method of interviewing, as religion was not mentioned hitherto in the contacts:

> P. You know I oughtn't to be conceited, but I've a feeling that I've changed into another person—I've changed way down deep. I think God has helped me too. I couldn't have changed this much if God hadn't helped me. The first thing I do when I get out of here is to go to Church and thank God—not that I haven't thanked Him here—I just feel so close to God now, I feel good and clean and that I can be close to Him.
>
> Just talking these things over with you—being able to get them all off my mind has helped, too . . .

To help anyone to arrive at a deep experience such as this, is not only to feel that we have been of real help to him, but also is a tribute to the effectiveness of the techniques that have been used in this method of interviewing.

FURTHER READING

Counseling and Psychotherapy, CARL R. ROGERS (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston). A detailed exposition of this method of interviewing, with a long verbatim case record at the end of the book.

Counseling with Returned Servicemen, ROGERS & WALLEN (McGraw Hill Book Co., N.Y.). Although written for a special purpose, it is a concise and handy textbook of this method, with many practical suggestions for improving these techniques.

Personality Factors in Counseling, C. A. CURRAN (Grune & Stratton, N.Y.). Research in the method. An analysis of twenty recorded interviews with one case and a competent exposition of the factors involved in aiding treatment.

The Art of Counseling, ROLLO MAY (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, N.Y.). Written by a Congregational Minister in U.S.A., an approach to interviewing not entirely confined to this method. A practical guide in the psychology of interviewing.

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER

(The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise)

Catholicity. A Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West. Dacre Press. 2s. 6d.

The modest appearance of this pamphlet should not conceal its importance. Two years ago the Archbishop of Canterbury asked Dom Gregory Dix "to convene a group of Anglicans of the 'Catholic' school of thought to examine the causes of the deadlock which occurs in discussion between Catholics and Protestants and to consider whether any synthesis between Catholicism and Protestantism is possible". *Catholicity* is the report of this group, which included Canon A. M. Ramsey (Chairman), the Dean of King's College, London, the Warden of Keble, Canon V. A. Demant, Mr. T. S. Eliot, Dr. A. M. Farrer, the Bishop of Southampton and others, with Dom Gregory Dix and Fr. A. G. Hebert as secretaries.

The group first presents "the primitive unity created by our Lord", "the many-sided unity of the apostolic tradition", a primitive wholeness able to embrace inevitable tensions; for their burden is that "the problem of reunion is that of the recovery of the 'wholeness' of Tradition". Owing to the breach between East and West, "The Western tradition which split up in the sixteenth century was already a defective tradition". The middle of the report is given up to an analysis of "the three main types of Christianity with which the modern world is familiar": orthodox Protestantism, Liberalism and post-Tridentine Catholicism. This analysis is brilliant: it is unusually succinct and clear, and is close-packed with thought-provoking observations. It is followed by remarks on right and wrong methods of moving towards "overcoming the inner fragmentation of Christianity"; lastly, the achievement and promise of "the Anglican Communion" in the sphere of unity is briefly indicated.

An outstanding character of the report is this: its authors combine an earnest attempt to state the positive and essential contributions of each tradition with a frank exposure of its errors and abuses, as they see these. They are, moreover, "well aware of the share of their own school of thought in these sins of distortion and omission". This makes the reader readier to ponder their pungent criticisms of other traditions, including his own—even if he feels that, inevitably, the match is played on the home ground.

> If theologians are not agreed from the outset in believing the Church to be a Divine fact prior to the individuals who compose its membership, in believing its outward order to be a part of its being, in affirming the unity of the faith, in recognizing the authority of 'Tradition' together with that of Scripture, then they have not reached agreement about the first principles of the unity they are seeking.

How many readers of this *Quarterly* would agree to each of these four "first principles"? But whether or no, they should wrestle (critically) with *Catholicity*.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Authority of the Old Testament. By A. G. HEBERT. Faber. 15s.

The conflict between the old conservative view of the Bible as a divine book which infallibly declares divine truth, and the view, due to scholarship, that it is a human and fallible book, is an old story. But Fr. Hebert has necessarily to begin here. The former view is untenable. The difficulty created for the Old Testament by Liberal Protestantism was that, as a result

of its representation of the prophets, rightly enough, as marking a real turning point at which Hebrew religion was sharply distinguished from heathenism, the reliability of the narratives of the early history from the Exodus onwards was brought into the region of doubt. The prophets enjoyed genuine religious experiences. But we are rightly reminded that the basis of their faith lay in the tradition of the choice of Israel as God's people, and His guidance of them in history. It is to this tradition that Fr. Hebert turns. The Bible is the "Book of the Divine Kingdom", the record of the divine purpose wrought out in history through the Israel of God. This story begins with Abraham, and ends where Church history commences. He is thus able to say, using 'Church' to mean the Israel of God, that "the Church . . . is not 1,900 but 3,400 years old" (p. 294). The Bible, as the Book of the Divine Kingdom, possesses authority as the historical record of the beginnings of Israel, over which the Kingdom was set up, as the record of God's nature revealed in His relations with and will for man, and as the proclamation of the fulfilment, both in prospect and in actuality, of the divine purpose in Christ. The above-mentioned conflict is resolved, for not only is the Bible of divine authority for these reasons, it is also a collection of human documents in which the Revelation is only imperfectly apprehended. Revelation is distinguished from Inspiration: the writers recorded the Revelation under the guidance of Inspiration, which is God's, and not to be understood as a psychological term to describe the spiritual competence of the writers.

Here are a few of the questions which arise out of a study of the closely knit argument of this book. The present endeavour to recover the Old Testament as an integral part of Christian Scripture is subject to the danger of obscuration of its great difference from the New Testament. There are not lacking signs of that danger here. There is, in fact, not only continuity, but a real discontinuity between the Testaments. In the New Testament the basis of community within the elect people is quite different, the two Israels are different, even though, as the New Testament says, the New Israel is the heir of the Old. On the other hand, Fr. Hebert rightly stresses the importance of establishing, as far as possible, the historical reliability of the Old Testament account of the Exodus, on which the traditional faith of Israel was based. But if the story of the Kingdom started, as he says, with Abraham, what are we to say of the fact that it was only subsequent reflection which transformed the patriarchs from polytheistic nomads into Yahweh-worshippers? There is here a conflict between tradition and the facts.

The long and valuable, but controversial, discussion of the interpretation of the Old Testament I pass over for a few remarks on the least satisfying section of the book. The question, Why is the Old Testament Canon what it is? really finds no answer except that it was formed under providential guidance. Though its formation is, indeed, described at length, we must take it or leave it. The Canon approaches canonization! If we speak, as Fr. Hebert does, of providential guidance in the formation of the Old Testament Canon, it is legitimate to ask whether it is the Roman and Greek Churches in accepting Apocryphal books, or Protestantism in rejecting them, which can claim such guidance. Protestant Christianity has made the Hebrew Canon the first part of its own, but, on the other hand, the Apocrypha is employed in the New Testament. And is it irrelevant to enquire, as the early Church did, whether *Jude's* explicit quotation from *Enoch* proves the latter's inspiration or the former's lack of it?

These queries and criticisms are not meant to detract from a weighty contribution to a subject of living interest for the Church today.

A. J. B. Higgins.

The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. By C. K. Barrett. S.P.C.K. 15s.

This book sets out to solve a problem. Jesus proclaimed the nearness or the presence of the Kingdom of God; the early Church proclaimed a personal experience of the Spirit. The Church believed itself to be a community of the Spirit. The Synoptic Gospels are almost silent on the subject of the Spirit and inspiration. The problem is a twofold one: Why do the Gospels say so little about the Spirit? And whence did the Church derive its notions about the Spirit of God, and its certainty that it was inspired, if not from the teaching of Jesus?

The author's method is to examine all the references to the Holy Spirit in the Gospels. The story of Jesus' birth, His baptism by John, the Temptation in the wilderness, the accounts of exorcism, are each in turn submitted to a thorough survey. The conclusion is reached again and again that Jesus was a 'pneumatic' person, but the interest of the Gospel writers was not in this, but in the fact that He was Messiah. It was in virtue of this that He had power over demons and could declare this as a sign of the presence of the Kingdom of God.

This examination of the Gospel narratives is the background for Part II of the book. Here the references to the Spirit in the teaching of Jesus are enumerated, with the conclusion that little or no indication can be found that Jesus thought of the Spirit as present with the disciples, or that He looked forward to a Spirit-filled community. Mr. Barrett has his answer to the question why this was so. To speak of His own inspiration or possession of the Spirit would have been to betray the Messianic secret. The presence of the Spirit with men was the mark of the fully realized Kingdom of God, which was not to come until after His ministry. He did not prophesy a Spirit-filled Church, because of His eschatological outlook.

Enough has been said to show that this is a precious mine for those who have patience to dig. The line of argument is not always easy to follow, partly because of digressions which might well have occupied an Appendix. There is valuable matter in the illustrations from Jewish sources, which show that the background of the Gospel writers was Hebrew rather than Greek. There is some almost incidental but illuminating discussion of points like the Trinitarian formula in *Matthew* and the Beelzebub controversy. If the first part of the book could have been rearranged and compressed, fuller discussion would be welcome of the relation between Jesus' eschatological outlook (too easily taken for granted here) and His thought about the Spirit. The author has given an answer—not necessarily the only answer—to his first question, why there are so few references to the Spirit in the Gospels. He has scarcely touched on the second, the source of the Church's doctrine of the Spirit. This possibly lies outside the scope of this book.

H. A. Guy.

The First Epistle of Peter. The Greek Text, with Introduction and Notes. By F. W. Beare. Oxford: Blackwell. 15s.

This commentary follows hard on the heels of the great commentary by Dr. Selwyn, and was in the press before the larger work could be consulted. But it is by no means otiose. It is the fruit of excellent scholarship, and while in general avoiding grammatical minutiæ it gives a clear exposition of the thought of the epistle, which is none the less sound because it occasionally suggests that a Biblical concept cannot be shared by the present-day Christian. The comment is notable for clarity of expression and forthrightness of judgment. The Greek text is set out at the top of the page with an English version immediately below it, followed by a selection of variant

readings and the notes proper. The translation is the author's own; it inclines to excessive literalness rather than to paraphrase. The textual variants are kept to a minimum but presuppose a good knowledge of textual criticism. Space is made in the commentary itself here and there for textual matters (*e.g.*, on the Vulgate variations at 2^{23} and 3^{22}); this helps to make up a lack in Selwyn's work. There is no index at the end, but that is forgivable in a book of this kind.

In distinction from most English commentaries Petrine authorship is firmly rejected and the epistle is held to be a work of *c.* 112 A.D., consisting of an urgent exhortation called forth by persecution (4^{12}-5^{11}), to which the author, or later editor, has added a baptismal discourse (1^{3}-4^{11}) composed when the prospect for a Christian community was less threatening. This theory of composition, proposed by Perdelwitz in 1911, and made familiar to English students by Streeter in his *Primitive Church*, has hitherto received no support in the major commentaries in English.

The conclusion of the note on "the stone which the builders rejected" (2^{7}) is an example of Dr. Beare's exegesis: "Christ is too great to be neglected or avoided. For His followers, He becomes the foundation on which all life rests; where He is rejected, there can be only chaos and anarchy". This is true exposition, going beyond elucidation of words, or illustration of the thought by reference to other religions, avoiding allegorical fancy, and drawing out the meaning in a way which makes its applicability plain to any who are serious in acknowledging Christ's Lordship. The author does not hesitate to indicate where he thinks *I Peter* is so conditioned by its age as to be inadequate for us today; *e.g.*, the excellent note on 1^{12} shows why the first Christians for theological reasons regarded the Old Testament as Christian scripture, but repudiates any obligation to perpetuate a wrong conception of prophecy, or misinterpretations of particular passages. On 'the spirits in prison' (3^{19}) Dr. Beare writes: "The doctrine of the descent of Christ into Hades, though it has captivated the imagination of many generations and has even found a place in the Creed, belongs to the periphery of Christian teaching, not to the centre—if it can be said to have any legitimate place in Christian teaching at all". Dr. Beare confesses difficulty over the predestination implied in 2^{8} but in the course of his note points out how salutary it may be as a corrective of our "too comfortable" idea of God. His iconoclasm is never merely naughty, but always worth pondering.

The commentary is inadequate in passages concerning the death of Christ; the reference to this on 3^{18} "as an act of sacrificial love for us as persons, not specifically an act which deals . . . with our sins" is a rather superficial contrast, and one wonders whether Dr. Beare's views of atonement have prevented him from coming to grips with fundamental New Testament conceptions here. The note on 2^{24} fights shy of the sacrificial implications; doubtless this is the influence of such scholars as Anderson Scott and Feine. On $1^{18f.}$ Dr. Beare is less open to criticism. But has he not rationalized too much on this subject, and overlooked the irrational aspect of the problem of man's sinfulness?

E. C. Blackman.

The Elements of Moral Theology. By R. C. Mortimer, M.A., B.D. Black. 10s. 6d.

This book by the Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford is written "to provide a simple introduction to moral theology and to familiarize Anglican readers with some of its methods and technical terms" and, as "there is no Anglican manual of moral theology", in the hope that this "tentative sketch or framework" may lead to "the production of something greater". As its author says, it makes "great use

of Roman manuals but goes behind them to their main source, St. Thomas Aquinas". The first chapter deals with The End of Man. Then follows a chapter on Law in which it is stated that the Legislative power of the Church "resides in the Apostles and their successors, the Bishops" and it is argued that "the moral authority of a measure derives precisely from the (Church) Assembly. It is its legal authority, its enforceability, which derives from Parliament". Subsequent chapters deal with "the nature of those human actions upon which conscience passes judgment" and "the criterion of judgment" by which human actions are judged. In the chapter on Conscience, there is a long discussion on "the means of converting a doubtful conscience into a certain one", and the systems of moral theology which answer this question, tutiorism, probabiliorism, æqui-probabilism and probabilism are expounded. An opinion is not to be regarded as "probable if its opposite has been declared by the Church. For Roman Catholics the Church has spoken finally on a great number of issues. For Anglicans there are authoritative statements on comparatively few questions, and the rest are left to the conscience of the individual, to decide for himself what is his lawful course. Hence the importance for Anglicans of a correct understanding of the principles of probabilism", and this is illustrated from the question of contraceptives. The remainder of the book deals with the Virtues, the Three Theological Virtues of Faith, Hope and Love, and the Four Cardinal Virtues of Fortitude, Temperance, Justice and Prudence. "The essence of faith is assent to the word of God, through the Church the interpreter of His self-revelation". "Heresy is sin against the virtue of faith since it consists in the denial of a divinely revealed truth". "It is sinful to allow, and *a fortiori* to invite, heretics to take a public part in the services of the Church" and Professor Mortimer deplores the permission given "by authority in the Church of England for joint services of public worship to be held or for ministers of Nonconformist bodies to take part in services in Church on certain specified occasions and under specified conditions". In one place Professor Mortimer dissents from St. Alphonsus de Liguori for he does not agree that "if a man intends to set fire to his enemy's house, but by mistake burns that of his friend instead", he is not bound to recompense his friend. In his discussion on virginity, he even ventures to differ from the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Roman Church that virginity is superior to the married state, for he holds that the contemplative and the active life are two ways of life "of equal value". The Index of Quotations with which the book concludes is significant. It cites four quotations from St. Paul, eleven from St. Alphonsus, thirty-four from St. Thomas Aquinas and none from the Prophets or from the Gospels.

This book is attractively written but we have found it disappointing. Christian Ethics is one thing; Moral Theology in the Roman and Anglo-Catholic sense another. The teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas is full of interest but it is better to study it in the relevant volumes of the *Summa Theologica*. St. Thomas sets out fully and candidly the views which he opposes, whilst his own conclusions are a subtle and impressive synthesis of Biblical and Patristic teaching and medieval Church praxis expressed in the framework of that Aristotelianism which was the New Learning of his age. The moral theology of the Roman Church is a necessary adjunct to the work of priests in the confessional. (English readers will find it presented with admirable clarity in The *Moral and Pastoral Theology* of Henry Davis, S.J. which, first published in 1935, is already in the fifth edition. The first of its four volumes covers much the same ground as this book and with much greater precision.) This book has the legalism of a Roman Catholic manual but lacks that note of authority which comes from the supposed infallibility of a Church which claims to be the only true representative of Christ on

earth. We know what the Romans mean by the Church; we know what the New Testament means; but what Professor Mortimer means we are unable to discover. It is saddening that so gifted and influential a professor of the Church of England should write on Christian morals as if our Lord had not rejected the legalism of the Pharisees and St. Paul had not written his Epistle to the Galatians.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The English Clergy and their Organization in the Later Middle Ages. The Ford Lectures for 1933. By A. HAMILTON THOMPSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 20s.

This "account of the condition of ecclesiastical institutions in fifteenth-century England" is divided into six parts. First, we see the bishops at work in their exercise of "powers which were pre-eminently judicial", study their appointment as "the test question by which the relations between the English Church and the Apostolic See in the fifteenth century can be put to the proof", and watch the "steady growth in the influence of the Crown over the choice of spiritual rulers", so that "no very violent transition was necessary to lead . . . to acknowledgment of the royal supremacy". "The association of bishops with politics" also "became more constant in the fifteenth century than before". We are shown "The Organization and Administration of the Diocese" by vicars-general, officials, archdeacons and rural deans: the organization "has become highly centralized" and "the whole character of the business . . . is somewhat formal and mechanical." The constitution and internal life of "Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Chapters" is studied: "primarily they were founded for corporations of clergy, whose sole duty, whether in person or by deputy, was to maintain a continual succession of services" and whose interests "outside church" "were mainly secular". A chapter follows on "Parsons, Vicars, and Curates". We then have "Chantries and Colleges of Chantry-Priests", "the most characteristic foundation of the later Middle Ages", founded frequently by lay religious guilds. The concluding chapter, on "The Monasteries", shows how largely "the monastic ideal was forgotten"; "in fact, the whole tendency was to abandon the common life essential to the monastic system, and live like members of a club." The book has over 100 pages of appendices, and 27 pages of index of persons and places.

In this work Professor Hamilton Thompson presents the conclusions of a life-time's study. Apart from several earlier studies of his own, his bibliography includes nearly 40 episcopal registers which he has read in manuscript. He knows the fabrics of the churches as well as he knows their constitutions. Much of his book is somewhat technical, but he has a remarkable gift of clear exposition, however complicated his subject. What he reveals, mostly by the way, of the religious life of the time will not please those who regret the Reformation; "but hard facts prove more than sentiment, and bishops' threats than tradesmen's bills". The lectures repay reading, as they repaid hearing in 1933, and to enjoy much of them it is not necessary to be a specialist.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Let God be God. An Interpretation of the Theology of Martin Luther. By PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

In this country, Luther the Theologian has been strangely neglected and misunderstood. For a long time the *Primary Works* and the *Commentary on Galatians* were the only works English readers knew, and nearly all they could know. The bulk of his writings still await translation into English. Calvin has been more fortunate. Those black-uniformed volumes that stand

so grimly rank upon rank upon the shelves of college libraries are there to tell us who and what manner of man Calvin was, and how he conceived and executed his theological task. And even if—as too frequently happens—we have read none of them but the *Institutes*, we are not so unjust to Calvin when we judge him by that one book as we are to Luther when we judge him by the *Primary Works*. There is more of the real Luther in the *Commentary on Galatians*, though we are not likely to meet him unless we read the book with more care than John Wesley seems to have given to it. In these circumstances it is not surprising that Luther has been misunderstood. We have come to take it for granted that although Luther was a religious genius whose faith was simple, not to say *naïve*, in the realm of theology he had no originality, and indeed no real competence, so that his thought is a tissue of scholastic odds and ends, incoherent, self-contradictory and defying our attempts to make sense of it. Mr. Watson, in this Fernley-Hartley Lecture, should succeed in convincing us that this is a serious mistake; and that Luther, though not a systematic theologian, carries through his theological work with a fundamental consistency and a truly remarkable concentration on what he regarded as the central concern of faith and religion. The title of this book—*Let God be God*—expresses this concern. It is this that Luther hears the Gospel saying to the sinner—and to the theologian also. As for his originality, Luther effects what Nygren has called a "Copernican Revolution" in theology. He found it anthropocentric and left it theocentric—transferring its centre of gravity from man in his torment of sin and anxiety to God in His grace and reconciling love.

Mr. Watson introduces us to the important researches of Karl Holl, Nygren, Aulén and other interpreters of Luther, and this clearly written and scholarly outline of Luther's theology is documented by a wealth of quotations. Altogether, the book is easily the best introduction to Luther that we have in English, and the very full indices greatly add to its usefulness. We look forward to a promised second book in which Mr. Watson will treat certain great Lutheran themes in greater detail. Meanwhile we are very grateful for this one.

H. F. Lovell Cocks.

The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England. By A. T. P. Williams. S.C.M. 6s.

The Christian Future. By E. Rosenstock-Huessy. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

Dr. A. T. P. Williams, the Bishop of Durham, has written for the Anglican Communion a companion volume to the Rev. E. A. Payne's *The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England*. Whereas Mr. Payne produced an eminently readable digest of Free Church history with a challenging valuation of the present position of the Free Churches, Dr. Williams has chosen to write a collection of historical essays, each a vignette of the period under review. By this method he avoids tiresome details and holds the interest of the non-specialist. These essays abound in Anglican lore not readily accessible, and enable the author to be more of a commentator and less of a narrator. Shrewd epigrams, revaluations of important figures and a pleasing urbanity of style all make this book a delight to read. The chapters on the Oxford Movement and the Twentieth Century are outstanding.

Professor Rosenstock-Huessy's volume is more stimulating, even breath-taking. It is a difficult work to classify, for it is history, sociology, and theology combined in a tract for the times. The author unites the liberal's emphasis on the necessity for taking this world seriously with the orthodox insistence on the primacy of the other-worldly and eternal order. He believes that the only future for our world, living as it does in "an air-conditioned nightmare", is a Christian future. Only the Christian faith can

recreate men, for it is, paradoxically, a *living* tradition. His most profound chapter (VII) is entitled "The Penetration of the Cross". In this he explains the nature of "crucial thinking" on four fronts: outward, inward, backward, forward. This Christian philosophy (for it is no theosophy for the *élite*) has been hammered out in the course of an unusually varied life in which the author has been, in turn, lecturer, soldier, founder of the Frankfurt Academy of Labour, factory administrator, editor, professor of sociology and law, and organizer of work-camps, in both Germany and the U.S.A. He is a profound and arresting Christian thinker.

HORTON DAVIES.

The Russian Idea. By NICOLAS BERDYAEV. Bles. 18s.

Everyone who thinks at all today is interested in Russia. It is not a matter of predilection: it is one of compulsion. Russia, vast and inscrutable, looms upon the horizon like an enormous black cloud. What, men ask, will come of it? Will it be thunder, lightning and storm, or will the much-dreaded cloud prove to be big with mercy, and ready to break with blessings?

Berdyaev undertakes to explain Russia to us. The means adopted is a study of the Russian thought of the nineteenth century, a time of continual ferment, the great time of the intelligentsia which came into being as a result of the impact of the West upon Russia. It was Peter the Great who brought about this impact. Before him Russia was governed by two forces, both of them alien from the culture of Western Europe. One was the native paganism of the people, a wild Dionysiac element full of strange and terrible potencies: the other was the Cæsaro-Papacy of the Russian state, founded upon the alliance between the Tsardom and the Greek Orthodox Church.

The stirring of mind in the educated classes was not the least of the results of Peter's action: this stirring reached its highest point in the nineteenth century, when Schelling, Hegel, Marx, St. Simon, Fourier, J. S. Mill and Spencer, all in turn, influenced Russian thought. The result was even more varied than the influences which produced it. Slavophils, devoted to the past of Russia, opposed Westerners who admired foreign civilization. Orthodox Christians engaged in controversy with atheists. The intelligentsia seethed like the witches' hell-broth in *Macbeth*:

"Double, double toil and trouble.
Fire burn, and cauldron bubble".

The brew cleared itself in the two great geniuses, Dostoievsky and Tolstoi. What was the result of all this working?

Russia, says Berdyaev, is either nihilist or apocalyptic: he proceeds to show that it is both. In nineteenth-century Russian thought there was on the one hand a nihilistic reaction against the conventional civilization of the West, identified with the *bourgeois* mind and spirit: it was rejected as formal, legal and finite, as the complacent satisfaction of man in his own works. On the other hand there was an apocalyptic fervour which more than anything else expresses the soul of Russia, discontented with the finite and yearning for the infinite. Russia in her best representatives has always dreamed of a Kingdom of God, a society founded not on law but on love, in which man is not limited by his own products, the works of civilization, the state and industrialism. The idea is that of a free creative life in community; but it is not the work of man in his pride, saying, "Is not this great Babylon that I have builded?" It is the work of God deifying man by realizing the potency of the Divine image in which he is made.

Berdyaev admits that he is interpreting Russia from his own point of view, making a selection from the manifoldness of Russian thought. It must be admitted that at the moment Russia wears a sterner and more discouraging

face in her outlook upon the world. But, says Berdyaev, she has been filled ever since the nineteenth century with the Messianic consciousness of a mission to reform the world, and to offer to it something better than *bourgeois* civilization. Which provokes the urgent question: If Russia is indeed filled with such a consciousness, will she aim at the political Messiahship which Jesus rejected or at the spiritual Messiahship which He approved?

The Russian Idea is not a very easy book to read, but it contains much recondite information; and throws valuable light on one aspect at least of the Russian enigma.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Albert Schweitzer, The Man and his Mind. By GEORGE SEAVER. Black. 18s.

This is an outstanding book on one of the great personalities of our time. It is written with knowledge, enthusiasm, and judgment, and the result is a biographical study of entrancing and moving interest. The book can be warmly recommended to all readers: to young and old alike. The first half of the volume, devoted to the life of Schweitzer, and his wonderful medical and pioneer work at Lambaréné, in tropical Africa, is an inspiring record of great accomplishment, in the fact of almost insuperable difficulties. It is an adventure story of the highest class; a story of the power of the Christian gospel in the life of one man, and through him, its compelling and commanding power in the lives of others. The second half of the volume is devoted to Schweitzer's contribution to the intellectual life of our time, as Philosopher, Theologian, and Musician; so the specialist, as well as the general reader, is provided for in this excellent book. It only remains to be added that the book is well produced and very attractively illustrated.

A. M. HENDERSON.

Herbert Fisher, 1865-1940. A Short Biography. By DAVID OGG. Arnold. 10s. 6d.

Walter Howard Frere, Bishop of Truro. A Memoir. By C. S. PHILLIPS and others. Faber. 16s.

Arthur Quiller-Couch. A biographical study of Q. By F. BRITTAIN, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 15s.

Mr. Percy Withers called his study of A. E. Housman *A Buried Life*. Mr. Ogg might have called his "short biography" of H. A. L. Fisher *A Public Life*. We see Fisher as the Oxford Don, as Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield, as President of the Board of Education, as Cabinet Minister, as Warden of New College, and as an author (with special attention to his *History of Europe*). In all this Mr. Ogg follows Fisher's own "rigorous and invariable subordination of his private to his public personality", as also his "invariable detachment". We hardly meet Fisher the man, even the "legendary" Fisher. There are no examples of the "spontaneity, agility, incisiveness" of his conversation, and few passages from letters or diaries—"I hate psycho-analysis", Fisher said. There are, however, fascinating pages on Oxford in 1884, on the development of education in England leading up to the Fisher Act of 1918, and on contrasting schools of historiography ("Acton, the most erudite man of his generation, was also the most credulous"); and one finishes desirous of reading more Mr. Ogg rather even than the *History of Europe*.

Detachment is also a keyword in Dr. Phillips' account of Frere, but with a difference; for this is the detachment of "otherworldliness". "It was intolerable for me to possess money"; he would not allow a woman to help him when waiting at table; "I would prefer to do what I'm told": for Frere, that is, "all other purposes and interests were subordinate to those of the Religious Life". "For the first time for four centuries a monk became,

deliberately and with the knowledge of the Anglican authorities remaining a monk, a bishop of the English Church," and for English Church history his episcopate, whether "successful" or not, was a landmark. For his own life, however, "Truro was no more than an epilogue"; it was his years as Superior of the Community of the Resurrection that were "the great creative period." Dom Gregory Dix, Professor A. Hamilton Thompson, the late Evelyn Underhill and others present Frere in turn as liturgist, historian, musician, spiritual leader and link with the Orthodox Church. Dr. Phillips and Fr. E. K. Talbot, who writes on Mirfield, accomplish the more delicate task of conveying Frere's adroit, paradoxical, tangential personality. "The dancing swing of his walk" is recalled more than once, and even as an undergraduate "he moved lightly and daintily through life in a cloud of amber and auburn"; yet underneath was "a steely discipline", as of "a finely-tempered blade", and "an inflexible will" ("I regard sitting on the least comfortable chair as *very* important"). Nor did his evident saintliness preclude an elusive airiness in manipulating circumstances, which could be provoking, if not "foxy".

Did the Bishop of Truro know his neighbour and contemporary, Q? Both had H. F. Stewart for a friend; both were noted as undergraduates for their check suits and bright waistcoats. But whereas Frere became an ascetic Q remained a *connoisseur* in food and clothes: he "disliked Nonconformity and detested teetotalism"; though he was attached to Bernard Manning. It is as an anthologist that he will be remembered, but Mr. Brittain shows also the devoted Cornishman, busy with local politics and education, as well as the Cambridge Professor of English Literature and the author of some 30 novels, besides much literary criticism. In every capacity Q was himself, the "very perfect gentle knight": deliberate, ceremonious, yet ingenuous. These qualities are each as evident in his handwriting—the letter reproduced in blue watermarked paper is a delight—as in the letters of which admirable use is made. "Though his roof had fallen, the pillar stood upright": these words of Q's on Kenneth Grahame after the death of Grahame's only son apply finely to Q in like case. A bibliography and two portraits add finish to a work produced with a restrained artistry.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

The Rev. A. Herbert Gray's *The Secret of Inward Peace* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.) says that the men needed today are men whose lives are based on an inward peace which a relationship to God alone can give. The instability of character, the one-sidedness of lives devoid of vision, these prevailing faults all derive from the lack of inward peace; they tell of the restlessness of minds not fixed on God. Dr. Gray speaks of the nature of this peace, how it may be won, and on what conditions it holds fast in the fever of our time. This book, written with a winning humanity, has behind it a long pastoral experience. It has knowledge and understanding, is kindly in its judgments, and profoundly Christian in spirit. All through there runs a hesitancy on the author's part lest he should seem to profess more than he can make good; this adds force to the book's quiet spiritual culture.

I have read with much pleasure the Rev. Dorothy F. Wilson's *The School of Manhood* (S.C.M., 6s.). It is a book of personal religion, about the growth of Christian character, its foundations, and the elements which go to the making of a mature Christian mind. Miss Wilson has an aptness for seeing things from the angle of youth; and though her book has a wider and more

general appeal, I imagine it will be particularly helpful to men and women in the Universities, and to other similar types of mind. The discussions are never in the air, and they are very relevant to our current perplexities. Miss Wilson acknowledges her debt to Professor H. H. Farmer and many others; there are useful references at the end of the chapters to many books, chiefly modern. There might perhaps well be a few more references to the old masters.

They Testify of Me (Friends' Book Centre, 2s. 6d.) is a Bible Study Handbook, edited by Miss Margaret B. Hobling. It contains six papers read at Group discussions, and Miss Hobling writes an introduction. These are papers with a spiritual gift, not without rays of an inner light.

Father Wainwright, by Miss Lucy Menzies (Longmans, 6s. 6d.), is a restrained but affectionate tribute to Father Wainwright, for 56 years at St. Peter's, London Docks, and the record of a life of utter selflessness devoted to the service of Christ and the poor. Wainwright was perhaps the last of those older Tractarians such as Stanton and Mackonochie; he carried out implicitly the precept of his Master about having come to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. Literally day and night he gave himself and all he had to care for the sick, and to healing the brokenhearted. In the end all Dockland loved him; and when he died, it was "washed with tears". More than once in reading this life I have been reminded of Newman's prayer for his brethren of the Oratory. For any man this book is sobering.

In *Christ is Alive* (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.) the Rev. G. R. Beasley-Murray sets down for the general reader the evidences for Christ's resurrection. The chapters on the empty tomb, and on the post-resurrection appearances need a somewhat fuller treatment, but they are sound apologetic as far as they go: those on the place of the resurrection in the early history of the Church are to the point, and the argument is well put together. Probably R. H. Hutton's discussion of the evidences for the resurrection is little known today, but it might well be added to the authorities Mr. Murray mentions. This is a welcome book.

Dr. A. R. Vidler's *Good News for Mankind* (S.C.M., 3s.) contains eight addresses on Christian faith and practice which he delivered at Cambridge in 1947 during the mission to the University.

The Rev. H. D. Gray's *A Theology for Youth* (Religious Education Press, 5s.) deals in a popular way with problems and questions often raised by young people in regard to religious belief; and it is an effort to put theology in a way which will satisfy youth. There is no such thing as a theology for youth : apparently what is meant by the title is an attempt to put Christian theology in a way more easily understood by youth.

A. T. S. James.

The well known Clarendon Old Testament series reaches a worthy conclusion in Prof. S. H. Hooke's *In the Beginning* (Oxford Press, 6s.), which, as the title indicates, is a study of *Genesis.* The author, as would be expected, has much to say about the myth and ritual pattern of the religion of the Near East, and, while using the generally accepted literary analysis as a starting point, is really concerned to draw out the witness of the myths and sagas of *Genesis* to conditions of life and society, and to indicate resemblances to customs and beliefs in neighbouring peoples, as these have been revealed by archæology in recent years. A book such as this, intended for non-experts, is a healthy corrective to any impression that the time has come to discard painstaking historical study of the Old Testament in favour of more exciting theological pursuits. To mention one or two points: no support is given to the view popularized by Woolley that Abraham's religion was a development, arising from the Sumerian family god, in the direction

of monotheism; Abraham was later than Hammurabi; and some scholars believe that Joshua preceded Moses. The book concludes aptly with an essay by the late Dr. Edwyn Bevan on "The Religious Value of Myths in the Old Testament".

The Topical Bible Concordance (Lutterworth Press, 5s.), originally compiled in 1850 by the Religious Tract and Book Society for Ireland, has been revised and augmented by Mr. D. M. Miller. It is intended "for the use of ministers, missionaries, teachers, and Christian workers", and is attractively produced in a handy, portable form. It differs, as its title indicates, from the large concordances in presenting, not occurrences of words, but classified subjects, which are usefully collected in an index. The book's usefulness is beyond question; but its uncritical standpoint is revealed, *e.g.*, by the citation under "Preciousness of Christ" of *Psalm* 45^2 and *Song of Songs* 1^3.

In *Letters to Young Churches* (Bles, 10s. 6d.) Mr. J. B. Phillips gives us a new translation of the New Testament Epistles, each of which is preceded by a short introduction. The translation, which is free, reads well and will succeed in its purpose of throwing light on dark places. Sometimes, however, the rendering is not too happy. "Father, dear Father" is too sentimental a substitute for "Abba, Father" (*Gal.* 4^6; in *Rom.* 8^{15} the rendering is "Father, my Father"). Dr. C. S. Lewis contributes an Introduction.

The Apocalypse of Saint John (Sheed & Ward, 8s. 6d.) consists of a translation of a commentary by the Dominican Père R. J. Loenertz, preceded by the text of *Revelation* in the Douai version. Unlike some expositors of this book, the author does not try to discover in it what it does not contain, but sticks pretty closely to elucidation of the actual text. "There is nothing to warrant our looking to it for a prophetic history of Christianity".

A. J. B. Higgins.

A Sixteenth Century India Mystic, by Dr. W. G. Orr (Lutterworth Press, 18s.), is an important contribution to the most interesting, and in the West least known, phase of Hinduism, its proclamation of salvation not by works or by knowledge but by the way of *bhakti*. The saint with whom he deals is Dadu, who belongs to the traditions of Ramananda and his Muslim disciple Kabir. The book begins with an account of the legendary life of Dadu and ends with a description of the modern Panth which bears his name. But its chief significance lies in its attractive translations from Dadu's poems and its illuminating discussion of his teaching. The doctrine of *karma* has checked the growth in Hinduism of a true theism, yet Dadu's poems show how eagerly he sought for a God worthy of men's worship and how nearly he came to a true ethical monotheism. We warmly recommend this notable addition to the material on which the study of religion must be based.

Sydney Cave.

I have read *Morals and the New Theology* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.), by Mr. H. D. Lewis, Senior Lecturer in Philosophy in the University College of North Wales, with much interest. It is a controversial work, criticizing Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, N. Micklem, R. Niebuhr, O. C. Quick and J. S. Whale for their reactionary and pessimistic outlook which fails to do justice to the moral philosopher's concern for freedom and responsibility. The book is to be welcomed for its honest criticism, and it ought to teach theologians to be careful in their use of words, and to take account of how they may be misunderstood. The strength of Mr. Lewis' plea is his own concern for moral standards; its weakness is that his quotations, though accurate, do not illuminate the purpose of the thinkers who wrote them. This is especially true with regard to Niebuhr and Barth. It is also to be noted that he includes one eminent philosopher, W. G. de Burgh, in his condemnation, and that

not all moral philosophers with religious sympathies would take as limited a view as he does of corporate responsibility.

But Mr. Lewis has a genuine concern, and he should be listened to; and his plea that theologians, philosophers, and psychologists should have a greater understanding of one another deserves our hearty assent.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Whither Theology? (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.) is the title chosen by Dr. William Robinson for his 1945 Louisa Curtis lectures at Spurgeon's College. After a sketch of the five "great periods of theological activity", which he calls the creative, scholastic, reformation, critical and confessional periods, he indicates five "essential biblical patterns" (his sub-title). These deal with "The *Living* God", "The People of God", Providence, human creatureliness and grace. Many other issues arise in the discussion. Dr. Robinson builds on the biblical encounter with God as "a personal God in personal relationship with His people", as over against the abstract, legal and mechanical notions which "have played havoc with theology all down the ages". Within the limits of the author's purpose, this is a great little book: it makes theology come *alive*.

Dr. C. J. Cadoux's posthumous *Philip of Spain and the Netherlands* (Lutterworth Press, 18s.) is a curious work. Its sub-title is "An Essay on Moral Judgments in History", but from this angle the tail wags the dog. For, after one chapter on this subject and another on "Catholic Revaluations in History", with some forceful pages of attack on Roman Catholic propaganda in the *Times Literary Supplement*, the book is given over to assessing the characters of Philip II of Spain and William of Orange, and the matters at issue between them. This is accompanied by a continuous volley at Dr. W. T. Walsh's *Philip II* (1938), and the Rev. R. Trevor Davies' *The Golden Age of Spain, 1501-1621* (1937), for these authors' admiration of Philip, approval of the Inquisition and dislike of William and Protestantism. The book is a powerful indictment of Roman Catholicism, and may best be considered as an extended footnote to the chapters on persecution in *Catholicism and Christianity*. It may be doubted, however, whether its method is suited to its purpose (this, too, requires judgment), or even whether many will read it. Those who do may lay it down with a sigh, almost of relief that its author is at rest *ubi sæva indignatio ulterius cor lacerare nequit*.

The first two of the new "Contributions in Modern Philology" published by the University of Michigan (London: Cumberlege, 3s. each) are Mr. L. F. Dean's *Tudor Theories of History Writing* and Mr. N. E. Nelson's *Peter Ramus and the Confusion of Logic, Rhetoric, and Poetry*. The former summarizes the conventional theory under six headings, and indicates contemporary criticisms of it, with special attention to Raleigh's *History of the World*. The latter is an astonishingly bad-tempered attack on the logician whose influence on New England Puritanism, Professor Perry Miller has argued, was fully as great as that of Augustine or Calvin; to Mr. Nelson Ramus's logic is "a farrago of *a priori* nonsense".

A new *History of the English Baptists* (Kingsgate Press, 12s. 6d.) has been written by Principal A. C. Underwood. After shorter chapters on Forerunners, the first General and the first Particular Baptists, 1640-1660, and Renewed Persecution, we have longer accounts of Toleration and Decline, Revival, and Consolidation, with a final chapter entitled Larger Horizons and New Problems. As its title suggests (there is in any case no Baptist denominational "-ism", even had Dr. Underwood wished it), the book is in large degree a series of "pen-portraits of prominent personalities". This has its attraction, which the illustrations increase; it also has disadvantages. The sources used are, in the main, conventional, and it is not

clear in what way the book is intended to supplement, or to supersede, the *History* by Dr. W. T. Whitley, to whom it is dedicated; but it is written in a style both pleasant and clear, and one feels that the people described are real people. There is also a good index.

Vol. XXV of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society's Publications, obtainable from the Society, Streatley, nr. Luton, includes two articles of interest to Free Churchmen: one on "A Luton Baptist Church Minute Book, 1707-1806", with copious extracts; and one on the Beds. early Quaker, John Crook, J.P., whose influence the author says, with pardonable exaggeration, was "at least as great as that of his contemporary Bunyan on the Baptists".

The Rev. Wesley F. Swift's 1947 Wesley Historical Society Lecture deserves attention. Its subject is *Methodism in Scotland: the first hundred years* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.), and it poses the problem of "the ineptitude of Methodism in the days of its greatest opportunity, as contrasted with the aptitude of Congregationalism in the same period"; for "after a century of unremitting toil, there were only 2,143 members in Scotland, 1,643 fewer than there had been forty years earlier". Others besides Methodists have found Scottish Presbyterianism a hard nut to crack, and there is much worthy of comparative contemplation in this clear, frank and well arranged account.

". . . the Itinerant Plan . . . is, in one sense, the very life of Methodism". This same itinerancy, which, Mr. Swift shows, militated against Methodism's appeal to the settled life of Scotland, favoured Methodism when it came to winning the moving population in America, where by 1850 the Methodists were already the largest Protestant body, with 1,324,000 members. This point is made in Dr. W. W. Sweet's 1946 Beckly Lecture, *The American Churches: an interpretation* (Epworth Press, 5s.), in which the author, often drawing on his own previous work, also discusses the part played in American religion by revivalism, negro religion and Roman Catholicism; against the last he notes a "rising tide of resentment". The book is a masterly survey of "those historic influences which have made the American Churches what they are".

It is not yet ten years since Mrs. Melcher's study of *The Shaker Adventure* appeared. This is now followed by Professor Julia Neal's *By Their Fruits* (North Carolina Univ. Press; London: Cumberlege, 20s.), "The Story of Shakerism in South Union, Kentucky" from 1805 to 1922. The Shaker movement has less interest for Englishmen than for Americans, and such a detailed study of one colony which never numbered more than 349 (in 1827) may seem difficult to justify; but it includes material interesting to compare with the activities and interests of other revivalist and communist groups. According to Professor Neal, who has used several MSS. Shaker journals, "The Shaker way of life has made a real contribution to American art".

An American poetess who deserves to be better known in this country is Emily Dickinson, whose dates, 1830-1886, were roughly contemporary with those of Gerard Manley Hopkins in this country. 650 new poems of hers have now been published by Mrs. M. T. Bingham under the title *Bolts of Melody* (Cape, 18s.). "Most of them were smothered with alternative words and phrases", and from the facsimiles shown it is evident that the versions printed are often highly disputable. Emily Dickinson, however, was so distinctive in her vocabulary, rhythms and "tone", that even the most arbitrary variants could hardly be anyone else's. Her unfailingly "dry" expression of pain and ecstasy is as strangely exciting here as in earlier volumes.

Two recent memoirs published by Cumberlege from the *Proceedings* of the British Academy are *Andrew George Little, 1863-1945* (4s. 6d.), by Sir

Maurice Powicke and *Sir Charles Oman, 1860-1946* (2s. 6d.), by Sir Charles Grant Robertson. Little devoted himself almost entirely to one subject, Franciscan history, which "may seem narrow", but his work proved inspiring "for all who wished to see the barriers between this and that field of learning broken down"; for "he saw the Franciscan movement as part of a wider development in religious, ecclesiastical, and educational life", and "the man was not lost in the scholar". Sir Charles Grant Robertson brings out the character of the bluff, doughty, unpunctual Professor of History that Oman was, a Fellow of All Souls for 62 years, whose "memory made one feel that stories about Macaulay were not exaggerated".

The Rev. Ephraim Levine has written a brief memoir of *Joseph Herman Hertz, 1872-1946* (Soncino Press, 10s. 6d.), the Chief Rabbi from 1913 till his death; Dr. Hertz is shown as scholar, preacher, statesman, Zionist and human being. "All his teaching was directed to the thesis that Judaism and life are one". GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Mr. Seton Pollock in *Stubborn Soil* (Sidgwick & Jackson, 12s. 6d.) writes on *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes* and *Job*, "as a layman who has profited by the best scholarship available to an English-speaking student". In the first part of the book he indicates, in a series of short connected essays, the permanent significance of the Wisdom literature. The second part consists of new *ad hoc* versions of the three books, designed, not as substitutes for the familiar translations, nor as paraphrases, but to serve as a bridge between modern scholarship and the general reader, and to make clear the relevance of the originals to our own time. This book should prove a very present help in trouble, and induce the reader to reopen a perhaps neglected section of the Bible with renewed enthusiasm and understanding.

The standard English version by Sir Edwin Arnold of the Bhagavad-Gita, the Gospel of Hinduism, appeared more than half a century ago. Such classics should be translated afresh for each generation, and in a style as far as possible consistent with the idiom of the time. *The Song of God: Bhagavad-Gita* (Phœnix House, 6s.) is to be recommended as a new and very readable translation from the Sanskrit by Swami Prabhavananda and Mr. Christopher Isherwood. In his introduction Mr. Aldous Huxley describes the Gita as "perhaps the most systematic scriptural statement of the Perennial Philosophy", and relates its doctrines to those of the other higher religions.

Miss M. P. Willcocks in *A True-Born Englishman* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) calls Fielding "the most English of all Englishmen". This book is more than a life of Fielding, about whom not a great deal can be known for certain. Miss Willcocks indulges in lengthy, but always interesting, 'asides' on society and the social scene in England during the first half of the eighteenth century. The book is well illustrated, and, though she writes in a popular style, the author has tapped unusual sources, from which she quotes frequently and to great advantage. The verses quoted on p. 51 are, however, not by Dr. Johnson, who was fond of reciting them, but by "an inferiour domestick" of the Duke of Leeds.

Professor F. A. Pottle of Yale is best known in England as the editor of the *Boswell Papers*. In *The Idiom of Poetry* (Cornell Univ. Press; London: Cumberlege, 14s.) he is writing for a wider audience, and, as a critical relativist, his appeal is to all poetry lovers, whether their idol be Shakespeare or Pope or Mr. T. S. Eliot. Briefly his thesis is that idiom—any characteristic way of writing poetry—is the ground of distinction between literary periods. Each idiom is valid for its period, though none is absolutely valid. It is the poets who apprehend the idioms fit to express successive shifts in sensibility, as it should be for the critic to recognize and define the idiom proper to his time. But no analysis can suggest the quality

of this, a book that it would be difficult to praise too highly. Everyone who wants to know what poetry is, or what criticism should be, should read it. Professor Pottle enlightens and convinces the reader not least because he fulfils his own conception of the ideal critic—"First, foremost, and all the time he will be *humble*".

Dr. Wilma L. Kennedy's oddly entitled *The English Heritage of Coleridge of Bristol 1798* (Yale Univ. Press; London: Cumberlege, 14s.) seeks to trace the basis in eighteenth century English thought for Coleridge's distinction between Fancy and Imagination. It is a study of anticipations rather than of influences, and is remarkable rather for thoroughness than for insight. Even if, as the author maintains, it can be shown by a study of the æsthetics of Addison, Berkeley, Reynolds and Blake that all the elements in Coleridge's theory of Imagination had been anticipated, the fact remains that the "whole" of a great poet's theory, inasmuch as it is the elaboration of uniquely personal or mystical (and not merely intellectual) experience, is something different from the sum of any parts into which intellect can divide it.

About 1850 the popular American novelist, John Esten Cooke, wrote an essay on *Poe as a Literary Critic* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press; London: Cumberlege, 5s. 6d.). This essay, edited with an introduction and notes by Mr. N. Bryllion Fagin, is now published for the first time by the Poe Society of Baltimore. It is a slight performance (under 3,000 words), but of some interest as being by a contemporary, and one who had attended Poe's famous lecture on "The Poetic Principle" in Richmond, Virginia, in 1849.

Captain Paul Le Butt's *We Too Can Die* (Anscombe, 8s. 6d.) describes a series of incidents in the Burma campaign of 1944. The author's straightforward narrative style effectively suggests the horror and pathos of guerilla warfare in the tropical jungle. The episodes are written in the form of fiction, but little would have been lost, and some gain in vividness might have resulted, had they been frankly autobiographical.

P. A. Spalding.

Among the first titles of a promising new series of popular studies of the English novelists are *The Brontës*, by Miss Phyllis Bentley, and *Samuel Butler*, by Mr. G. D. H. Cole (Home & Van Thal, 6s. each). Miss Bentley assesses the debt of the Sisters to Celtic temperament and Yorkshire environment, and shows the important effect on their later life and work of the highly developed imaginative world of childhood. Miss Bentley is an obvious choice to write good sound sense about the three strange sisters. This she does, and also gives a fine appreciation of the quality and power of their writing.

Mr. Cole provides a clear and useful introduction to Butler. The newcomer especially is given an understanding of Butler's relations with his family and with Miss Savage, which had so large a part in his writing as well as his life, and also of his dealings with "Darwinism", Higher Criticism and so on. He is at his best as a satirist; himself a thorough *bourgeois* laughing at *bourgeois* follies.

Paradise Lost and its Critics, by Prof. A. J. A. Waldock (Camb. Univ. Press, 8s. 6d.), is not a popular study—though perhaps it comes appropriately now that the B.B.C. has discovered Milton's great epic. Mr. Waldock considers the contributions of several recent critics—notably Mr. C. S. Lewis; but his chief concern is with the impression of the poem itself on the reader. This, he believes, is different from both the stated intent of the poem and the impression Milton wished to create, and is due partly to difficulties in the theme itself and partly to Milton's poetic imagination

overriding his doctrinal purpose. To this extent the poem is a failure. But, one may ask, how far is this "wrong impression" due to the reader's sympathies being already enlisted on the wrong side in the great encounter?

Mr. B. Rajan's highly documented contribution to this discussion, *Paradise Lost and the 17th Century Reader* (Chatto, 10s. 6d.), may well be read alongside Prof. Waldock's study. It seeks to establish the mental and emotional climate of the period, the familiar philosophical, religious and literary ideas of the time, and the assumptions Milton could make about the reactions of his readers. In this background Milton could confidently expect the poem to succeed and to achieve his desired effect. No doubt Mr. Rajan would agree that this background is entirely foreign today. Perhaps this is to be regretted in relation to more important matters than literary criticism.

Portrait of Edith Wharton (Cape, 10s. 6d.) employs the memories of many of the devoted circle of her friends, so that we see her as from many points, but Mr. Percy Lubbock has so delicately and subtly arranged the composition that we see the neat figure clear and whole. She looks down upon us, precise, assured, fashionable, the great lady. Life was good for her, and writing, for all the power of such books as *Ethan Frome*, was only part of it—indeed she seems not to have discovered her gift at all until she was 35. The many hands that have made the picture show how she inspired devotion, but there must be few of us who could have found her an intimate friend.

Mr. T. Thompson has produced two new books for our delight. *Lancashire Lure* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) is another collection of those brief Lancashire sketches he has already made familiar and beloved. Owd Thatcher and the rest of the company under the Barber's Pole are, surely, immortal characters. These, and others with them, bring tears to our eyes; sometimes tears of human pathos, but more often tears of laughter.

In Crompton Way (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) Mr. Thompson uses a wider canvas for the story of Samuel Crompton, friend of the common folk, unwilling contributor to the industrial revolution—the inventor of the spinning mule. This is not just another "industrialist's saga", but a portrait of a real and interesting man, an inventive genius, but a child in the affairs of the world, too honest for the business of the expanding cotton trade and of a mystical inclination ill-understood even by his friends. At times the telling of the tale becomes too much of a documentary report, but the scene and background are living Lancashire, Crompton is always a sympathetic figure, and Samuel Dawson, the pill-maker and friend, is a delightful study.

Present official talk of National Parks and country rights of way and access makes us hope that the Pennine Way, of which Mr. John Wood writes, may soon be a real way on which we may walk freely. Mr. Wood's *Mountain Trail* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) is a personal and descriptive account of the Way and its surroundings from the Peak to the Cheviots, and there are many illustrations and pictorial maps by Mr. Donald Foster. Even those people whose feet will never carry them over Pen-y-Ghent or Cross Fell may enjoy travelling with Mr. Wood and Mr. Foster through these pleasant pages, especially in the livelier latter half of the journey.

K. W. WADSWORTH.

Some people regard Canon V. A. Demant as one of the most profound and significant of contemporary thinkers; others, like the late Mr. Sidney Dark, take a very different view of him! Nobody can say that he deals in superficial diagnoses or trivialities. His latest book, *Theology of Society* (Faber, 10s. 6d.), is a collection of his writings spread over the last ten years. This time-range is sometimes a disadvantage, for the reader has now and

again to pull himself up and remember that this or that passage was written before the war. The essays deal with a wide variety of subjects and Canon Demant seldom fails to be stimulating. It is, in fact, a meaty book which is well worth the money.

Religion and Society (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) consists of lectures delivered in 1942 at the University of Calcutta by Professor Radhakrishnan. The first chapter deals with the need for religion and contains a penetrating criticism of Marxism. The second is concerned with the Atlantic Charter, which, the writer contends, will never be implemented without the moral driving power of religion. Turning specifically to Hinduism, he writes of Dharma and of the position of women. The final chapter on War and Non-violence contains a tribute to Gandhi who, the writer believes with unbounded admiration, "presents to us the purest, the most elevating and the most inspiring ideal known to man". Some readers will feel, however, that he does not elucidate what seem to them the baffling contradictions of Gandhi. A great deal has happened in world affairs since these lectures were delivered and it may be that Professor Radhakrishnan would now revise some of his judgments.

There are few more urgent problems than that of relating "the Christian understanding of life in the world to the problem of personal conduct in an industrialized, highly competitive and often immoral society". This problem is well handled by the Rev. Alexander Miller in *Christian Vocation in the Contemporary World* (S.C.M., 3s.). Mr. Miller was for a time a member of the Iona Community and is deeply influenced by Dr. G. F. MacLeod.

Marriage Tie or Tangle, by the Rev. N. A. Turner-Smith (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.), consists of five talks giving an excellent statement of the Christian view of marriage. It is produced in an attractive form suitable for presentation to young people about to be married, but it might have a larger circulation if the publishers brought out a cheaper edition also, for some potential readers may think that the price is rather high for 29 pages of material (exclusive of the Marriage Service, which is printed at the end).

L. J. TIZARD.

Welshmen will be grateful for *Hanes Eglwys Y Tabernacl, King's Cross, Llundain, 1847-1947*, the history of King's Cross Welsh Tabernacle (W. Griffiths, 7s. 6d.), edited by the present minister of the Church, the Rev. Llewelyn Williams, B.A. It is interestingly illustrated, and traces the history of the Church from its foundation in Bartlett's Passage, Fetter Lane, in 1847 and its transference in 1889 to its present site in Pentonville Road, where latterly it was known as the scene for 36 years of the ministry of Dr. Elvet Lewis. The volume is a many-sided chronicle of devoted effort on the part of pulpit and pew to maintain a spiritual home for Welshmen from home.

W. A. DAVIES.

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

Principal P. W. Evans' 1946 Tyndale New Testament Lecture, *Sacraments in the New Testament, with Special Reference to Baptism* (Tyndale Press, 2s. 6d.), is largely a defence of *Matt.* 2819 as a dominical command to baptize. It is well reasoned, but unlikely to convince those who (for the reasons discussed) doubt the verse's authenticity.

In *The Baptist Movement in the Reformation and Onwards* (Kingsgate Press, 1s.), a lecture delivered before the Newcastle Theological Society, the Rev. E. A. Payne gives a clear account of the rise of Baptist convictions in Europe in the 16th century and again, independently, in the 19th. He points piquantly to contemporary uneasiness over infant baptism, as expressed by Barth, Brunner and the Bishop of Oxford.

In *The Healing of our Divisions* (Dacre Press, 6d.), an Oxford University sermon, Professor Michael Ramsey points to the real cleavages as not denominational but

between classical Protestantism, Western Catholicism and liberal Christianity, each of which is "a parody of the fullness of the Biblical and apostolic faith". He urges each denomination to be drastic with its own particular distortion.

Milton (Cumberlege, 2s. 6d.) was the British Academy's 1947 "Master Mind"—"the greatest master in our language of freedom within form", according to the lecturer, Mr. T. S. Eliot. In "his ability to work in larger musical units than any other poet" is "the most conclusive evidence of Milton's supreme mastery". Mr. Eliot is much concerned with his own past statements on Milton, several of which he now retracts.

Tribute to Thomas Davis (Cork Univ. Press; Oxford: Blackwell, 1s. 6d.) is a lecture delivered by W. B. Yeats in 1914 for the Thomas Davis centenary celebrations. There is a foreword by Mr. Denis Gwynn, and a hitherto unpublished letter from the poet "A. E." to Yeats. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

NEW EDITIONS

The Pilgrim's Progress, by John Bunyan (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.), illustrated in colour by Mr. Clarke Hutton, is especially commendable for its attractive form and typography. Another edition of the same immortal story (Faber, 12s. 6d.) is embellished by over 100 delightful pen-drawings by Mr. Edward Ardizzone which catch the spirit of Bunyan's day.

A very attractive new edition of Miss Mitford's *Our Village* (Harrap, 10s. 6d.) is charmingly illustrated with wood-engravings by Miss Joan Hassall. For the first time this collection contains all that Miss Mitford wrote about the Village—thirty shrewd and enchanting descriptive essays—and nothing more.

Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, by Gershom G. Scholem (New York: Schocken, $5.50), is concerned mostly with mediæval and later Judaism.

From the Independent Press comes a fourth edition of Dr. C. J. Cadoux's *Roman Catholicism and Freedom* (7s. 6d.). An *exposé*—the more effective because of its candour and toleration—of Rome's persecuting record, and a vigorous defence of Protestantism.

Sacraments: A Quaker View, by Alfred Kemp Brown (Friends' Home Service Committee, 2s. 6d.), has a preface to the second edition by William E. Wilson: "The Quaker believes that those who urge the necessity of Sacraments are unconsciously making the Love of God too narrow by false limits of their own".

The Rev. W. G. Tarrant's *The Story and Significance of the Unitarian Movement* is reissued by the Lindsey Press (1s. 6d.). The conclusion of the 1910 edition with its reference to "the constantly increasingly liberalism of all the Churches" mirrors a phase and a world which have passed.

Prof. G. D. H. Cole's *Life of William Cobbett* (Home & Val Thal, 16s.) makes its appearance in a third edition. Cobbett's life was a protest and a portent. He saw clearly the shape of industrial things to come.

ALSO RECEIVED

Nursery Song and Picture Book. Winifred E. Barnard. R.E.P., 5s. 6d. Cheerful and varied songs for small children. Effectively illustrated.

Abraham Lincoln. McEwan Lawson. *William Wilberforce*. Michael Hennell. *John Wesley*. *Thomas John Barnardo*. Jessie Powell. Lutterworth Press, 3d. each. Useful "brief biographies", the first being a model short biography.

Bible Quizzes. Vernon Howard. Pickering, 3s. 6d. Some 50 quizzes, varying in difficulty.

Young People's Concise Guide for 1948. E. J. Hayes, ed. R.E.P., 5s. A wealth of material competently presented by experienced teachers.

What is a Christian? R. G. Martin. R.E.P., 1s. 6d. Six excellent talks broadcast for Youth Clubs.

The Quiet Mind. G. Stephens Spinks. *After this Manner*. Leonard Mason. Lindsey Press, 6d. each. In "The Religious Life" series. Enriching devotional studies.

Shall We Follow Karl Barth? Sidney Spencer. Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d. Written from a Liberal Christian angle, it offers (Pt. I) an exposition of the Barthian theology, and (Pt. II) a criticism and an alternative.

Nebuchadnezzar's Image: A Layman's Thoughts on Christian Disunion. Charles Jeffries. S.P.C.K., 1s. 3d. The author wisely employs non-technical terms, but this merit is largely offset by the generalizations in which the text abounds. Insufficient importance is attached to the achievements and prospects of the œcumenical movement.

Some Chief Obstructions to Christian Unity. W. J. Sparrow Simpson. Faith Press, 1s. 6d. The difficulties are stated in a starkly uncompromising manner, *e.g.*, the passages on *"irreconcilable conceptions about the Ministry"*.

God the Father. Emile Guerry. Sheed & Ward, 12s. 6d. 89 meditations.
Cérémonial. Neuchatel & Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 4.75 Swiss fr. Liturgy of French Protestant "Third Order" ("Les Veilleurs").
Towards a Quaker Restatement. J. W. Harvey, H. G. Wood and others. Bannisdale Press, 1s. 6d. Very much "towards", and lacking in editing and proof-reading.
Crewe Congregational Church, 1841-1947. W. H. Chaloner. Author, University, Manchester. A centenary pamphlet.
Riqueza de las Inglesias Cristianas en Bibliotecas al sobrevenir la segunda guerra mundial. E. Sparn. Argentina, Cordoba. Statistics and tables concerning religious and theological libraries throughout the world.
Ancient Kingdom of Gwent: Monmouthshire. Olive Phillips. St. Catherine Press, 2s. 6d. No. 23 in "Footpath Guides", with detailed directions for walkers, photographs of district, and map. Fits comfortably into hip pocket.
Nursery Rhymes. Illustrated by F. R. C. Newnham. Methodist Youth Dept.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (October). Miss Dorothy L. Sayers is stimulating and provocative in "The Lost Tools of Learning"; present-day educational processes are compared with the mediæval scheme—the syllabus of the schools, to the disadvantage of the former. Under the title, "Miscarriage of the Social Order", Prof. J. W. Scott deals with the tragedy of mechanization; in "A Clear Voice Amid the Tumult", Mr. J. W. Poynter glances at Roman Catholic teaching since 1870 as contained in papal encyclicals. In addition to his philosophical and theological reviews Dr. S. H. Mellone contributes an article on "The Laughter of God". Sir William Munday writes on "Wisdom and Love in a Great Poem" (*The Divine Comedy*), Dr. A. H. Birch on "A Fifth-Century Apostle of Free Will" (Pelagius), and Dr. William Schenk on "A Democratic Tercentenary" (The Putney Debates).

Expository Times (August, September and October). Dr. T. W. Manson on "New Testament Ethics", and the Rev. A. Raymond George on "The Doctrine of the Church" conclude the useful series on "The Unity of the New Testament". In "Matthew and Paul", Dr. C. H. Dodd calls attention to the significant agreements between the First Gospel and the Pauline Epistles in eschatological teaching, in the idea of the Church, and in the controversy with Judaism. Another Congregationalist, Dr. Roderic Dunkerley, writes on "The Context of the Gospel Story"; and Dr. Matthew Black gives an exposition of "The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst". A review of P. T. Forsyth's *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* and *This Life and the Next* (reprinted by the Independent Press) is entitled "Old Soldiers Never Die"—a surprising concession to the newer journalism.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July and October). Principal H. Cunliffe-Jones expounds textually "P. T. Forsyth's 'Principle of Authority' "; the Rev. Robert A. Nelson writes on "Theology: The Modern Protestant Approach". Dr. C. H. Dodd has an eight-page review of the Bishop of Birmingham's much discussed book, *The Rise of Christianity;* " . . . the book, taken as a whole, has undeniably, and depressingly, a negative effect". The Rev. Cyril J. Davey writes on "The Significance of Thomas Coke", to whose bicentenary a long editorial note is devoted. Hymnologists will appreciate the articles entitled "The Poetry of Isaac Watts in his Imitation of the Psalms" and "On Mending Charles Wesley"; both, interestingly enough, are written by Methodist ministers. Dr. Maldwyn Edwards, always readable, tackles the question of Church unity with frankness and without pessimism.

Evangelical Quarterly (October). Prof. O. T. Allis provides an exposition of "The Parable of the Leaven" which challenges the interpretation popularized by Campbell Morgan. The Rev. H. P. V. Nunn compares "The Life Beyond the Grave in Homer, Vergil and Dante". Dr. S. M. Zwemer discusses the Ascension; and Prof. Alexander Ross has a meditation entitled "The Radiant Face" ("They looked unto Him and were lightened").

Review and Expositor (July). The epigrammatic style of Prof. Nels F. S. Ferré is displayed advantageously in a lecture entitled "The Savior Still". Dr. Dale Moody supplies "An Introduction to Emil Brunner"; he discusses the Swiss theologian's literary output, his relationship to Karl Barth, and his encounter with the Oxford Group. Dr. Edwin Lewis writes on "Philosophy and the Fourth Gospel", and Prof. Walter T. Conner on "Theories of Atonement".

Religion in Life (Autumn). A Congregationalist, the Rev. Howard J. Conn, drawing inspiration from William Law, writes searchingly on "The Serious Call and Our Ministry". Two articles are concerned with interrelated themes—"The Church

and the Labor Movement" and "Church and State in America"; in the former Dean Walter G. Muelder presents the challenge of the Christian ethic alike to employers, employees and practising Christians; while in the latter Dean Luther A. Weigle realistically describes the American religious scene. Further interesting contributions include Prof. T. S. Kepler's "On Coming of Age Religiously", Dr. H. F. Rall's "Salvation in Ecumenical Thought", and Dr. Robert Stevenson's "The Musical Wesleys".

Baptist Quarterly (October). The interest in this number is mainly domestic. The Rev. Ernest A. Payne surveys the undertakings of the Baptist Union during the last fifty years; Mr. H. L. Hemmens describes his "Forty Years with the B.M.S.". The time is ripe and the materials are available, says Dr. W. T. Whitley, for a new study of the Seventh-day Baptist movement in England; Dr. E. K. Jones writes of "Welsh Baptist Polity" since the formation of the Association in 1650. Tribute is paid to Charles Brown's long ministry at Ferme Park. The Rev. I. J. Barnes examines Barth's treatise, *Christengemeinde und Burgegemeinde*.

Harvard Theological Review (July). Of greatest interest is Prof. Henry J. Cadbury's erudite contribution on "Early Quakerism and Uncanonical Lore". As its title indicates, Prof. Morton S. Enslin's contribution, "Irenæus: Mostly Prolegomena", deals with the literary activities of that Bishop of Lyons who was also the first systematic theologian. Prof. Martin P. Nilsson writes technically on "Greek Mysteries in the Confession of St. Cyprian".

Anglican Theological Review (July). The Rev. Thomas Barrett thinks that "art and religion are uncomfortable bedfellows"; if provocative, his article—"Athens *versus* Jerusalem"—is also informative. Dr. Samuel M. Shoemaker enters a strong plea for "Personal Evangelism"; and the Rev. G. W. Edwards writes convincingly on "The Hand of God in History".

Friends' Quarterly (October). Three articles, grouped under the heading, "Their Challenge and our Answer", express a concern which arose at Yearly Meeting, that the work of the Friends Service Council should be intelligently supported by the whole Society. Thus E. A. Otto Peetz describes the work of the F.S.C. in Madagascar; Horace Alexander in India; and Johanne Madsen Reynolds in China. In "The Christian and the Present", William E. Wilson says much that needs saying about Christians and their dedication to God. "Jordans" is the title of a poem by Raymond Garlick; it breathes peace.

Church Quarterly Review (July-September). The Rev. Geoffrey Soden begins a study of "Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester". (In the list of contents the article is incorrectly ascribed to the Rev. D. W. Gundry.) Canon J. S. Bezzant sympathetically reviews *The Rise of Christianity* by Dr. E. W. Barnes. Interesting contributions deal with "The Country Parochial System" and "Clough at Oxford".

Scottish Periodical (Summer). A new journal edited by Mr. Ronald Gregor Smith (Oliver & Boyd, 5s.). Scottish interests will naturally figure largely, though by no means exclusively, in its pages. The "Letter from America" is written vigorously by Prof. David Daiches. Dr. Rudolf Bultmann's comments on certain passages in Emil Brunner's *The Mediator* are translated by the Editor under the title, "To Love Your Neighbour". Mr. James B. Caird has "Some Reflections on Scottish Literature", and Prof. Ian W. Alexander writes on "Valéry and Yeats: The Rehabilitation of Time".

Modern Free Churchman (October). The writer of the first article wonders whether the part played by laymen in the life of the Free Churches is sufficiently recognized, and pleads that they should be trained and organized for even more effective service. The Rev. H. I. Frith pays a graceful tribute to Dr. C. J. Cadoux. The contents of the following articles are fairly indicated by their titles and authors: "God, Miracle and the Reign of Law", by the Rev. Sidney Spencer; "Faith, Freedom and Fellowship", by the Rev. T. Wigley; and "The Christian Teacher and the Christian School", by Prof. W. R. Niblett.

Teachers of To-day (September-November). Contains a dozen articles of uneven merit on themes ranging from "The Battle for Peace" and "Youth and the Cinema" to "Membership Training in Presbyterian Churches". Contributors include Dr. Roderic Dunkerley, the Rev. Donald Macarthur and Mr. Sydney Taylor.

Yale Review (Autumn). An extremely interesting number, well produced on good quality paper with clear type. As usual, Prof. Arnold Toynbee paints on a wide canvas; in "Churches and Civilizations" he depicts their relationship in a new light. Writing on "The Democrats and the Future", Mr. Ellis Arnall suggests that the policies of the party of Jefferson require not so much reorientation as clear restatement; and Prof. David Mitrany—"International Consequences of National Planning"—discusses an all-too-obvious situation. There is an interesting Browning article—"The Virgin and the Dragon"—by Prof. William C. DeVane; and Mr. Morris Roberts writes knowledgeably on "Henry James's Final Period". Other articles tell of "France Revisited" and "The United Nations at Work". Fifty-four pages are devoted to reviews.

H. Cunliffe Jones.